7.2.102

From the Library of

Professor William Henry Green

Bequeathed by him to

the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

D-18
H3886
E
Vol. II
Copy 1

Wm Henry Green 1843

Jno Henry Green
P. L. Sem. Princeton
Jany 1843

W. H. S.

CHRISTOLOGY

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT,

AND A

COMMENTARY

ON THE

PREDICTIONS OF THE MESSIAH BY THE PROPHETS.

BY

E. W. HENGSTENBERG,

Doctor of Phil. and Theol. and Professor of the latter in the University of Berlin.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,

BY REUEL KEITH, D. D.

Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Virginia.

VOL. II.

CONTAINING THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES OF ZECHARIAH AND DANIEL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.:

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM M. MORRISON.

1839.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1839,
By Reuel Keith,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

CAMBRIDGE:
FOLSOM, WELLS, AND THURSTON,
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

CONTENTS.

	Page
On Matthew 2 : 23,	1
The Prophet Zechariah,	7
General Preliminary Observations,	7
I. Chap. 1 : 1 — 6,	15
II. Chap. 1 : 7 – 6 : 15,	16
1. The Vision of the Rider among the Myrtle Trees. Chap. 1 : 7 – 17,	16
2. The Four Horns and the Four Smiths. Chap. 2 : 1 – 4,	22
3. The Angel with the Measuring Line. Chap. 2 : 5 – 17,	23
4. The High Priest Joshua before the Angel of the Lord. Chap. 3,	25
5. The Candlestick with the Two Olive Trees. Chap. 4,	41
6. The Flying Roll. Chap. 5 : 1 – 4,	44
7. The Epha and the Woman sitting therein. Verses 5 – 11,	46
8. The Four Chariots. Chap. 6 : 1 – 8,	48
9. The Crown on the Head of Joshua. Vs. 9 – 15,	52
Chap. 7 and 8,	66
Chap. 9 : 1 – 10,	68
Concerning the Land of Hadrach,	69
Chap. 9 : 11 — 10 : 12,	114

Page

Chap. 10, ... 127
Chap. 11, ... 146
Chap. 12 : 1 — 13 : 6, ... 196
History of the Interpretation, ... 218
1. Among the Jews, ... 218
2. By the Christians, ... 226
Chap. 13, ... 233
Chap. 13 : 7 – 9, ... 242
Chap. 14, ... 254
The Seventy Weeks of Daniel, Chap. 9: 24 – 27, 292
General View, ... 292
Interpretation. Verse 24, ... 297
Verse 25, ... 328
Verse 26, ... 343
Verse 27, ... 354
The Definiteness of the Dates, ... 378
The *Terminus a Quo* of the Seventy Weeks, . . 381
Chronological Determination of the *Terminus ad Quem*, 392
The Agreement of Prophecy and Fulfilment with respect to the Distance of the *Terminus a Quo* from the *Terminus ad Quem*, ... 394
The Last Week and its Half, ... 408
The Non-Messianic Interpreters, ... 414

ON MATTHEW 2: 23.

Καὶ ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.

We here engage in a preliminary inquiry respecting the name of the city of Nazareth. As we find it only in the New Testament, different views might be entertained in respect to its orthography and etymology. Ours is the following: the name was properly and originally נֵצֶר; as the name of a city it received in Aramæan the feminine ending א; and lastly, on account of the original appellative signification of the word, a ת was sometimes appended to mark the *stat. emphat.* of the *fem.* in א. We have an analogous case in the name Dalmanutha, the same place which is called צַלְמוֹן by the Talmudists: see Lightfoot, *Decas Chorograph. Marc. præm.*, Opp. II. p. 411, sqq. Also probably in *γαββαθά*, נַבָּתָא, formed from the masc. נַב, *dorsum.* That the original form was *Nezer*, that this continued in use along with that also in ת, and that the ת served merely to designate the *stat. emphat.* or, if the Hebrew is regarded as the ground form, was only the hardening of the ה *femin.* which equally suits our purpose, we prove by the following arguments. 1. The testimony of the Jews. *David de Pomis* (in De Dieu, *Critic. Sacr.* on M. 2: 23.) says, נצרי מי שנולד בעיר נֵצֶר הגליל רחוק מירושלים דרך שלשת ימים, "A Nazarite is one born in the city Nezer, in Galilee, three days' journey from Jerusalem." In the Talmud, in Breschit Rabbah, and in Jalkut Schimeoni on Daniel, Christ receives the reproachful name, *Ben Nezer*, the Nazarene: see the passages in Buxtorf, *Lex.* c. 1383, in Lightfoot, *Disquis. Chorog. Johan. præm.*, Opp. II. p. 578, sq., Eisenmenger, I. p. 139.

Gieseler has endeavoured, it is true, on Matth. 2 : 23, (in den Studien und Crit. 1831, III. p. 591,) to give another meaning to this appellation. He supposes it to refer to Isaiah 11 : 1. It passed over to the Jews from the Christians, who called their Messiah בֶּן נֵצֶר, because he was the one promised by Isaiah. But this supposition is correct only so far, as this designation was indeed chosen by the Jews in reference to the assertion of the Christians, that Christ was the נצר predicted by Isaiah; as in like manner they gave him also the names נצר נאפוף, *adulterous Branch*, and נצר נתעב, *abominable* or *detestable Branch*, (from Isaiah 14 : 19.) comp. Eisenmenger, I. pp. 137, 138. But it is erroneous to attribute the origin of this appellation entirely, or even chiefly, to this reference to Isaiah 11 : 1. Against this the name itself is decisive. It would then have been not Ben Nezer, but only נצר. Gieseler asserts, indeed, that he in whom a particular prophecy was fulfilled, was "*the son of this prophecy*," and in proof of this usage he appeals to the fact, that the Pseudo-Messias under Adrian, with reference to the כוכב, Num. 24 : 17, called himself בן כוכב or בר כוכבא, because the star there promised had appeared in him. But this is only plausible; we can just as little prove from it, that Christ, as he in whom the prophecy concerning the Nezer was fulfilled, could be called Ben Nezer, as on the other hand we can prove from the appellation Ben Nezer, that the said Pseudo-Messias could be named Barkochba solely because the prophecy concerning the star was believed to be fulfilled in him. Reland has already shown (Geogr. II. p. 727,) that Barkochba probaby bore this name, as originating from Kokab, a city and region beyond the Jordan. He made his descent of such special importance, because he sought for a deeper meaning in the coincidence of the name of his birth-place with that of the subject of the prediction Num. 24. The assumption, however, that, among the Jews, he in whom a prophecy was fulfilled was called its son, e. g. the Messiah, the servant of God, the Prince of Peace, the Son of the Messiah, &c., is entirely without support, and improbable in itself. Besides, this import of the term Ben Nezer has the uniform interpretation of the Jews against it. Jarchi, in the gloss on the passage relating to this name in the Talmud, explains Ben Nezer by "he who has sprung from the city of Nazareth." Abarbanel, in his book *Majene Hajeschua*, after the citation of a passage from Jalkut Schimeoni, says; "Yet mark well how they have interpreted the little horn (Dan. 7 : 8) of the Ben Nezer, which is Jesus the Naza-

rene." Buxtorf also cites from the Lexicon Aruch, which is of high authority: נצר נצרי המקלל, "*Nezer* (or Ben Nezer) *is the accursed Nazarene.*" Lastly, it is inconceivable, that the Jews, in a connexion where they heap the basest calumnies upon Christ, should, without any explanation, give him an honorable appellation borrowed from the Christians. 2. This result is confirmed by the assertions of Christian writers. In the time of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 1, 7) and of Jerome, the place still bore the name of Nazara. The latter says, under the word *Nazareth:* "*Est autem usque hodie in Galilæa viculus contra Legionem, in quinto decimo ejus milliario ad orientalem plagam, juxta montem Tabor, nomine Nazara.*" (Comp. Reland, I. p. 497.) In the epistle 17, *ad Marcellum*, he identifies the name expressly with Nezer: "*Ibimus ad Nazareth, et juxta interpretationem nominis ejus videbemus florem Galilææ.*" 3. To these considerations we add that the *gentilitia* formed from Nazareth can be explained only when the ת is regarded as not belonging to the ground form of the name. For in that case it must of necessity be found in the *gentilitia*; thus e. g. from *anathoth* ענתי could in no way be formed, but only עֲנָתֹתִי. In the New Testament we find only the two forms *Ναζωραῖος* and *Ναζαρηνός*, never *Ναζαρεταῖος*. Gieseler has felt the difficulty which these names present on the common hypothesis, but has sought to remove it (l. c. p. 592) by the supposition, that the form received its peculiar stamp from regard to נצר, which the early Christians were accustomed to connect with נצרת. But this supposition would, at most, be admissible only in case the form נָצְרִי, also without ת, were not the exclusive one among the Jews, and the Arabic form also were not entirely analogous.

We may now inquire in what sense נֵצֶר was given to a place in Galilee as a proper name. Here the supposition of Jerome is undoubtedly to be rejected, viz. that Nazareth was so called as being the *flower* of Galilee; partly because נצר never occurs in this sense; and partly because it is improbable, that the place should receive a name which could be appropriate to it only *κατ' ἀντίφρασιν*. It is far more probable that it was thus called on account of its being so small a place, — a feeble twig in contrast with a stately tree. In this sense the word נצר occurs, Isaiah 11 : 1, 14 : 19; and also in the Talmudic idiom, where נצרים denotes *virgulta salicum decorticata, vimina ex quibus corbes fiunt.* Indeed there was the more occasion to give to the place this name, as the symbol was seen in

the surrounding region ; the chalky hills around Nazareth are covered with low shrubs and bushes, (comp. Burckhardt's Reisen, II. p. 583.) What these were in comparison with the stately trees which adorned other places, such was Nazareth in comparison with large cities.

This name attributed to the place on account of its small beginning, like the name Zoar, *little city*, was at the same time an *omen* of its future character. The feeble twig never grew to be a tree. In the Old Testament Nazareth is never mentioned, perhaps because it may have been first founded after the exile. It is unnoticed by Josephus. It was not, like most other cities in Palestine, ennobled by recollections of ancient time. Indeed there rested on it a special disgrace besides that which was common to the whole of Galilee ; as almost every land has its place or city to which some peculiar reproach attaches, often from accidental circumstances. This is clear, not only from the question of Nathanael, John 1 : 47, " Can any good thing come out of Nazareth ? " but also from the fact, that, from the earliest times, the Jews have supposed they were casting the greatest disgrace upon Christ, when they called him " the Nazarene " ; while the reproach resting on all Galilee was at a later period removed by the circumstance, that the most celebrated of the Jewish academies, that of Tiberias, was situated in it.

Let us now inquire how far the residence of Christ at Nazareth fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies. The prophets everywhere declare, that the Messiah, springing from the fallen and decayed family of David, should appear at first without external rank or dignity. The foundation for all other similar passages is found in Isaiah 11 : 1. " There shall come forth a rod out of the fallen stem of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit ; " which Quenstedt has well illustrated in the *Dissertatio de Germine Jehovæ* in the *Thes. Theol. Philol.* I. p. 1015, " *Ubi jam stemma Isai ex humilioribus initiis in Davide ad decus regiæ majestatis evectum non tantum axiomate regio et omni externo splendore, quem in Davide accepit, erit orbatum, sed etiam ad privatam conditionem, in qua erat ante Davidem, denuo redactum, ita ut trunci omni ramorum ac frondium apparatu denudati instar se habeat, nec quicquam supersit præter radices, nihilominus tamen ex illo trunco adeo acciso, et, uti videbatur, pœne arido procedet virga regia, et ex illis radicibus efflorescet surculus, super quem requiescet spiritus domini,*" etc. (Comp. Vol. I. p. 374.) The passage in Isaiah 53 : 2, entirely agrees with this ; " He grew

up before the Lord as a sprout, as a shoot out of a dry soil." To the נֵצֶר, in ch. 11, the יוֹנֵק here corresponds, to the חֹטֶר the שֹׁרֶשׁ, to the trunk hewn down, the dry soil; except that by this last, the lowliness of the servant of God is designated generally, while his descent from the now decayed and fallen family of David is not made specially prominent, though of course it is necessarily included in the general idea. The same idea is carried out further in Ez. 17: 22–24. Here, as descended from the fallen family of David, the Messiah appears as a small and tender twig, which, plucked by the Lord from the top of a lofty cedar, and planted on a high mountain, grows up into a stately tree under which all fowls shall dwell. In Jeremiah and Zechariah, in allusion to the figure employed by Isaiah of a trunk hewn down, the Messiah is called the Branch of David, or simply the Branch. (Comp. on Zech. 3: 8, 6: 12.) It is surely only necessary here to compare prophecy and history to render obvious the exact accomplishment of the one by the other. Not at Jerusalem, where was the seat of his royal ancestors and the throne of his house, (comp. Ps. 122,) did the Messiah fix his abode; but in the most despised city of the most despised province did the providence of God assign his dwelling, after the prophecies had been fulfilled by his birth at Bethlehem. The name of this despised city, which implied its lowliness, was the same by which Isaiah had signified the original lowliness of the Messiah himself.

We have hitherto considered the prophecies and their accomplishment independently of their citation in Matthew. We now add a few remarks upon the latter.

1. The more general form of quotation, *τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν*, in the plural, seems not to have been employed here without ground; although Jerome infers too much from it, when he says: "*Si fixum de scripturis posuisset exemplum, nunquam dicere, quod dictum est per prophetas, sed simpliciter, quod dictum est per prophetam; nunc autem pluraliter prophetas vocando ostendit se non verba de scripturis sumsisse, sed sensum.*" It is true, that Matthew particularly referred to Isaiah 11: 1, which not only announces generally the lowliness of the Messiah, but also especially designates it in the *nomen et omen* of the place where he dwelt. This is evident from the fact, that the quotation *ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται* could not otherwise be explained; since it would be in the highest degree forced to assume, that the term "Nazarene" here signifies an humble, despised person in general. But he chose the more general form of

citation, (comp. Gersdorf, Beitr. zur Sprachcharakteristik, I. p. 136,) in order to denote at the same time the collateral accomplishment of those prophecies which agree with that of Isaiah in the chief point, viz. the announcement of Christ's low condition, — in his residence at Nazareth. But such a reference shows that this was really the chief thing in the mind of Matthew; and that the coincidence of the name of the city with that which Christ bore in Isaiah, appears to him only as a remarkable external illustration of the exact connexion of prophecy and its fulfilment; just, indeed, as he considers every thing in the life of Christ, especially directed by the providence of God.

2. The phrase ὅτι κληθήσεται is then likewise to be explained by the fact that Matthew does not limit himself to the single passage in Isaiah 11: 1, but refers also to the other passages of a similar character. The expression itself, ὅτι κληθήσεται, is derived from one of these, viz. Zech. 6: 12. "Behold the man whose name is the Branch." It is, therefore, not necessary to explain it merely from the custom of the later Jews,* who attribute to the Messiah as a name that which serves in the Old Testament to mark some quality or feature of his character, — following in this the custom of the prophets themselves, who often thus employ some quality of the Messiah in the place of a proper name. This hypothesis is untenable, because it would be difficult to produce another instance, where the evangelists, in a literal quotation, have intermingled any thing *de propriis*, relating to proper names.

---

* As an illustration of this custom the following passage is highly appropriate, which we cite from Raim. Martini Pug. Fid. III. 3, 19, p. 685. "*Dixit R. Abba* יהוה *dominus est nomen ejus, sicut dictum est Jerem.* 23: 6. *R. Josua ben Levi dixit, germen est nomen ejus, sicut dictum est Zach.* 6: 12. *Sunt, qui dicunt, consolator, filius fortitudinis dei nomen ejus, sicut dictum est Thren.* 1: 16. *Ex domo R. Siloh dixerunt, Siloh est nomen ejus, sicut d. est Gen.* 49: 10, *donec veniat Siloh. Ex domo R. Chanina dixerunt, gratiosus est nomen ejus, sicut d. Jerem.* 16: 13. *De domo R. Jannai dixerunt, Jinnon est nomen ejus, Ps.* 72: 17," etc.

THE PROPHET ZECHARIAH.

GENERAL PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

Zechariah, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, was of priestly descent. Chap. 1 : 1, Berechiah is named as his father, and Iddo as his grandfather. The latter, among the exiles who returned with Joshua and Zerubbabel, filled the respectable office of overseer of a class of priests; comp. Neh. 12 : 4. That Berechiah died early appears from the fact, that v. 16. the same Zechariah is mentioned as immediate successor of Iddo in this office, under Joiachim, successor of Joshua. Accordingly Zechariah, at least in his later years, exercised, together with the prophetic, a priestly office also. This early death and the comparative obscurity of the father explain why, Ezr. 5 : 1, the descent of this prophet is referred immediately to the grandfather, according to a practice occurring elsewhere in similar cases. (See Beitr. 1, p. 47.)

The discourse, which opens the collection of the prophecies of Zechariah, was held, according to chap. 1 : 1, in the eighth month of the second year of Darius, beyond all doubt Darius the son of Hystaspes. See the almost unnecessary refutation of the strange assumption of Scaliger, that the prophet came forward under Darius Nothus, in Vorstius, *De Tempore Instaurati Templi Hierosolymitani*, and Vitringa, *Prolegg.* p. 15, sqq. We may well be convinced, that this was also the commencement of his course as a prophet. This appears, partly from the character of the discourse, which in its general tenor is clearly a preparatory introduction, and partly from the chronological arrangement of the collection, apparent from the superscriptions of the second and third prophecy, chap. 1 : 7, and chap. 7 : 1, which prove that the predictions, chap. 9 – 14, which are without date, belong to a period subsequent to the foregoing.

The prophet must have been still young when he first came forward. For his grandfather Iddo was then in the full discharge of

the duties of his office, as appears from the fact already mentioned, that Zechariah was his immediate successor. In addition to this, the prophet, chap. 2: 8, is expressly called a young man. As now according to Nehem. 12: 4, comp. with v. 1, the family of the prophet returned to Judea with the first expedition of the exiles in the first year of Cyrus, which was eighteen years previous to the second year of Darius the son of Hystaspes, Zechariah can have passed only the first years of his childhood in Babylonia, and consequently the Babylonish coloring of his prophecies was owing, not as Bertholdt and De Wette suppose, to his having received his education in Babylonia, but rather, in some degree, to the continuation of the Babylonish influence on the body of the exiles, though chiefly to the dependence which he everywhere manifests on earlier prophets, especially Ezekiel, who stood in immediate contact with the Babylonians.

Let us now consider the historical relations, under which the prophet came forward, and upon which he was called to operate. The advantages, which had been granted to the exiles by the command of Cyrus in respect to the rebuilding of the temple, were soon wrested from them through the machinations of their enemies, the Samaritans, in the Persian court. They were deficient in means to carry forward the erection of the temple, and still more in theocratic zeal; this had been already greatly damped, soon after the return, by the obstacles which unexpectedly occurred, while they believed themselves justified by the former promises in expecting nothing but prosperity and happiness. Each one was selfishly intent only on the improvement of his own affairs. Under these circumstances, and in this tone of the public mind, the repeal of the prohibition to build the temple, in consequence of the accession of Darius the son of Hystaspes to the throne, which had been promulgated under his predecessor, the usurper Smerdis, contributed but little to advance the work. It was necessary still, that a powerful influence should be exerted on the minds of the people. For this purpose were the prophets Haggai and Zechariah called of God; of whom the former, at whose exhortation the building of the temple was immediately recommenced, came forward two months earlier than the latter. Zechariah, as becomes a true prophet of God, has in view, throughout, not the advancement of the outward work, as such; he aims to produce among the people a thorough spiritual revolution, the fruit of which must be an increased zeal for the building of the temple. Those, on whom the prophet was called to operate, belonged to two

classes. First, the upright and true believers. These had fallen into great despondency and strong temptations, in consequence of the apparent contradiction between the divine promises and the actual appearance of things. They doubted both the power and the will of God to help them. It would often appear to them, that their own sins and those of their fathers were so great, that God could not again show them mercy. Here, where the prophet had to deal with troubled consciences, his office was to console. This he does, while he points from the gloomy present to the brighter future; and, while resuming the yet unfulfilled portion of the former prophecies, he represents the fulfilment as yet to be accomplished. The objects of his prediction are particularly the happy completion of the temple; the increase of the new colony by the return of the exiles remaining in Babylon; the preservation of Judea during the victories of Alexander, so destructive to the neighbouring nations; the independence of the people, to be won by the triumphs of the Maccabees; the blessings, which the believing part of them should receive through the Messiah, immediately on his first appearance; the final restoration of the ungodly part, once rejected on account of their disbelief in the Messiah; the protection and prosperity, which God will grant to Israel, when they shall have again become the centre and most important part of the kingdom of God. This aspect of the prediction of the prophet was the more weighty, the stronger were the assaults which threatened the faith of even the upright, in that future period when there would be no immediate ambassadors of God, and the more they needed a sure prophetic word to illuminate the darkness of their faith. The second class consisted of the hypocrites. These had returned in no less numbers from Babylonia, induced, not by the true motive, the love of God and his sanctuary, but by selfishness, the hope of sharing in all the blessings of God promised to those who returned, which they expected immediately, and in which, in their foolish delusion, notwithstanding the most emphatic declarations of the older prophets, they believed they had a right to participate, because they renounced gross idolatry, and exchanged it for that more refined, which consisted in the outward righteousness of works. It could not but happen that even then, in many instances, the disappointed hope would strip from unbelief the mask of hypocrisy. Still more frequently, however, must this be the case at a later period. For these, also, the prophet describes the future blessings of God, in order to excite them to true conver-

sion. But at the same time that he most emphatically declares, that this conversion alone can give them a part in these blessings, he reminds them of the judgments, which had fallen upon those who derided the warnings of the former prophets, he threatens them with new and equally fearful punishments, a new destruction of Jerusalem, and a new dispersion of the people, after they shall have despised the last and greatest manifestation of divine mercy, the sending of the Messiah.

With respect to the arrangement of the prophecies, the collection consists of four parts, distinguished by the time of composition; of which the second and the fourth, through the difference of object and the new application given to the discourse, fall again into different subdivisions, yet connected together, not only by being composed at the same time, but also by the similarity of the mode of representation and by their relations. 1. The inaugural discourse of the prophet, chap. 1 : 1 – 7, held in the eighth month of the second year of Darius; on what day is uncertain. 2. The emblematic portion of the collection, chap. 1 : 7 — 6, consisting of a series of visions, partly, as chap. 1 – 4, of a consoling and encouraging, partly, as chap. 5, of a threatening character, all imparted to the prophet in one night, the 24th of the eleventh month in the second year of Darius. 3. A discourse, at the same time didactic and prophetic, chap. 7, 8, held in the fourth year of Darius, occasioned by the earnest inquiry of the people, whether they should still observe the day of the destruction of Jerusalem as a day of fasting and mourning, or whether so favorable a turn of their fortune was now soon to be expected, that the former adversity would thereby be forgotten. 4. A prophetic picture of the future destiny of the covenant people, essentially like the second discourse, so that no chief point of that is wanting in this, but differing from it, partly in the method of the representation, — here the ordinary prophetic discourse, there a series of visions, — partly in the omission here of the distinct reference to the building of the temple, both in the exhortation and the prophecy. From this, taken in connexion with the position of the prophecy, at the end of the collection, we are authorized to conclude, that it was composed after the completion of the temple, therefore in every event after the sixth year of Darius. Hence it may be explained why the prophecy is without date. This was of importance in the three preceding discourses. In the first, because thereby the *terminus a quo* of the agency of the prophet was deter-

mined, which is noted, even by prophets who were accustomed elsewhere to subjoin no mark of time, comp. e. g. Isaiah, chap. 6. In the second, because it contained the promise, without doubt a few years afterwards fulfilled, of the happy completion of the temple by Zerubbabel. In the third, because the inquiry of the people was occasioned by definite circumstances existing in the fourth year of Darius. In the fourth discourse, on the contrary, which, as what was predicted in the second, as the nearest future, had already become the past, related only to events of the more distant future, it was entirely sufficient to know only in general the age of the prophet, which was already shown by the former notes of time.

Among the Jewish interpreters especially we find the loudest complaints of the obscurity of the prophet. Thus Abarbanel on Dan. chap. 11, remarks, "*Vaticinia Zachariæ usque adeo sunt abscondita, ut omnes interpretes, quantumvis periti, manus suas in explicationibus suis non invenerint,*" (Ps. 76 : 6.) And Jarchi, "*Prophetia Zachariæ valde abstrusa est; sunt enim in illa visiones somniis similes, in quibus opus est interpretatione. Et nos non poterimus assequi veram ejus interpretationem, donec venerit doctor justitiæ,*" (the Messiah, from Joel 2 : 23.) But the ground of this assertion, as the last words of Jarchi plainly disclose, was one which existed chiefly in themselves. The more the reference to Christ prevails in Zechariah, the more impenetrable must his obscurity be to those who deprive themselves of the light of the fulfilment, and, having formed their notion of a Messiah according to the desires of their own hearts, necessarily misunderstand and pervert what here occurs, in contradiction to their preconceived opinions, respecting the true Messiah, his humble condition and his death, his rejection by the greater portion of the covenant people, and the judgments inflicted upon them in consequence. The later rationalist interpreters find this ground of obscurity so far in common with the Jews, as that they also must anxiously strive to avoid perceiving too exact an agreement between the prophecy and the fulfilment, or any thing, which, like the humble Messiah, rejected by the covenant people, and suffering death, cannot be explained by attributing it to human foresight. In addition to this, their view of the prophetic order is any thing but suited to make them disposed to overcome the difficulties that really exist, by imploring the divine aid, and by using the utmost diligence. How entirely must the efforts, and consequently the results also, of a De Wette,

who pronounces beforehand, that the last part contains enthusiastic predictions, which mock all historical interpretation, differ from those of a Vitringa, who says (Proll. p. 60): "*Nec tamen obscuritas studiosum veri absterret ab investigatione genuini sensus prophetiæ, dum certo constat, subesse ei sensum reconditum rerum præstantissimarum, quas quilibet non incuriosus veri scire velit, si liceat.*" It is, moreover, not to be lost sight of, that though Zechariah, on account of the prevalence of symbolical and figurative language, as well as the roughness and abruptness of his style, is, in a degree, more obscure than the other prophets, yet the interpretation of him is facilitated by two circumstances, almost peculiar to himself. In the first place, a careful comparison of the parallel passages in the interpretation of this prophet, who leaned upon his predecessors, gives more decisive results, than in that of any other. Then, as he lived after the exile, he does not embrace in his prophecy nearly so large a circle of events, as those who flourished at an earlier period. The *clare obscure*, which e. g. in the second part of Isaiah, and in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, arose from the circumstance, that the whole series of future blessings, namely, the deliverance from captivity, and the Messianic time, were presented to them in one vision, here, where the prophet takes his position between the two events, in a great measure disappears.

It now only remains to mention some of the most important aids in the interpretation. With respect to Jerome, Theodoret, Grotius, and Calvin, we refer the reader to Vol. I. p. 283. The commentary of Calvin on the lesser prophets is far more carefully labored, than that on Isaiah. What especially distinguishes it, is the life and reality with which it exhibits the relation of the prophet to those for whom his predictions were in the first instance designed. In the developement of the hortatory portion he is here also far happier, than in that of the strictly prophetic; his aversion to all forced interpretation, which arose from his love of truth in exegesis, rendered him so distrustful of the earlier interpreters, who were often guilty of this fault in order to make out a reference to Christ, that, much more frequently than in Isaiah, and in about the same way as in his commentary on the Psalms, he deviates from them even where their interpretation rests upon the surest ground, and he everywhere endeavours to give to special prophecies a general meaning. In the interpretation of Zechariah, the defective nature of his helps, and of his knowledge of languages,

which were insufficient for the removal of the philological difficulties, which are by no means small, stood in his way; as did also the prevailing symbolical and figurative character of the prophet, which was little suited to the peculiarity of his mind. But, notwithstanding all these disadvantages, his commentary, the work of a Calvin, yields a rich profit; and the more so, since it has been either entirely neglected, or only very superficially and partially compared by the later interpreters, even, which is very surprising, by those of the reformed church.

Among the Fathers, Cyril of Alexandria yet deserves to be mentioned. His commentary on the minor prophets, was printed first at Ingolstadt, 1607, fol., then in the *t. III., Opp. ed. Auberti.* Among a crowd of allegorical interpretations of the Septuagint are found many fine remarks.

Of the Lutheran church after Luther (Werke, Walch Bd. 6, p. 3292 ff.), and Melancthon (Vorlesungen über den Sacharjah, Opp. t. II. p. 531 sq.), whose works, it must be confessed, afford in the main, little satisfaction, especially those of the latter, consisting of few pages, and designed only to exhibit some *loci communes* out of the prophet, Tarnov deserves to be mentioned. His *Commentare zu den kl. Pr.*, first separately, and then collectively, published by Carpzov (L. 1688, 1706), surpassed all that had preceded, and furnished a good basis for future labors. Besides these, we mention the *Commentar von Ch. B. Michaelis* in den *Biblia Halensia*, which is still the best help for a cursory reading of the Old Testament. As the *Commentar zu den kl. Pr.* is among the rest the most distinguished, so again, that on Zechariah is preferable to those on the other minor prophets. It exhibits a careful use of what had before been done, sound judgment, far less doctrinal prejudice, than e. g. in the *Commentar über den Psalmen*, and in general in the books commented upon by J. H. Michaelis; and, what in the case of Zechariah is altogether the chief excellence, a diligent citation of the parallel passages, which are not to be found so fully in any other general commentary; but, along with these excellences, he has indeed his defects; a want of imagination, producing peculiarly injurious consequences in the interpretation of Zechariah; frequently rather the work of a compiler, than one of deep and original investigation. Lastly, the Commentary of Burk, whose *Gnomon in Prophetas Minores, cum Præf. Bengelii*, Heilbr. 1753, 4to., is indeed far inferior to its exemplar, which does not so well admit of an imitation as

some others, and is particularly weak in philology, but still manifests independent study and an intimate acquaintance with the Scripture.

By far the most considerable works have proceeded from the Reformed church, and indeed almost exclusively from Holland. After the preparatory works of Drusius, reprinted in the *Critici Sacri*, besides Grotius, almost the only interpreter of the minor prophets among them, a comparison of whom still rewards the labor, and Cocceius (his Comm. on the *Proph. Minores*, t. III. Opp. p. 387, sq.), who deserves, at least, the praise of having given a wholesome impulse to his successors, who knew how to separate the wheat from the enormous mass of chaff, appeared the Commentary of Mark, on the minor prophets, (Amsterd. 1696 – 1701, 4 Bde 4to, neue Aufl. mit einer Vorr. vom Kanzler Pfaff, Tüb. 1734, 1 Bd. fol.) This is still the most important work on the minor prophets, a tolerably complete collection of the whole exegetical apparatus, a sort of *catena* of the earlier interpreters, and indispensable to every subsequent one, on account of the independent labors of the author; who, in a good measure free from the exegetical aberrations then prevalent in Holland, and occupying the middle ground between the two extremes, exhibits in general a sound judgment. It has indeed its dark sides, of considerable importance; is tedious on account of its prolixity and diffuseness, deficient in grammatical acuteness, and hence a frequent hesitation between different interpretations, or an inadmissible combination of them; it often exhibits more diligence in compiling than independent and deep investigation. Vitringa (*Commentarii ad Librum Prophetiarum Zachariæ, quæ supersunt.* Ed. Venema. Leuw. 1734, 4to.) it is to be regretted, was unable to finish his work, which was broken off by his death. We possess only his *Prolegomena*, the Comm. on chap. 1, 2, and a *Meditatio in Visum de Candelabro Aureo.* Still this work is worthy of its pious, learned, and talented author, (comp. Th. 1, 2, p. 12.) The *Sermones Academici vice Commentarii in Lib. Zach.*, of Venema, Leuw. 1789, 4to., have not yet been seen by the author.

We believe we need fear no contradiction, when we assert, that the present age has accomplished nothing for Zechariah, and indeed that the interpretation of him, because the diligent use of existing materials has been found too laborious, has considerably retrograded. The commentary of Rosenmüller, — not to notice the works of Bauer, — is, and this is the ground of its superiority to the rest,

little more than a reprint of that of Michaelis, with the omission of whatever did not suit the doctrinal views of the author; Eichhorn, who seems to have compared no other interpreter than Grotius, gives in his work on the Hebrew prophets only his exegetical fancies, which Theiner (die zwölf kleineren Propheten. Leipz. 1828), (also as an unsolicited continuation of the Brentano-Dereserschen Bibelwerkes, which is in many respects praiseworthy,) has for the most part contented himself with transcribing. The neglect of thorough study manifests itself in almost every thing that recent Lexicons and Introductions contain relating to Zechariah.

I.

Chap. 1 : 1 – 6.

The first revelation, imparted to the prophet in the second year and eighth month of the reign of Darius the son of Hystaspes. This prophecy, in which the prophet warns the people not to bring upon themselves the punishment of their fathers by a relapse into their sins, and exhorts them to turn to the Lord in sincerity, may be regarded as a sort of introduction, as well to the whole course of the prophet, as also to the collection of his prophecies. New and suspicious indications of inward apostasy from the Lord already showed themselves among those who had returned. Such particularly was the negligent prosecution of the building of the temple, which must be combated by a true prophet, not separately from its source, but in the deepest root from which it sprung. The prophet in his later predictions had to furnish a succession of consoling views to the troubled and desponding. In order that these might not be appropriated to themselves by those to whom they did not belong, and abused to the promotion of carnal security, it was necessary that true repentance should be prominently exhibited as the condition of the coming prosperity. The threatening of new judgments for those, who would not fulfil this condition, contains already in the germ all that the prophet in chap. 5, and chap. 11, more definitely predicts concerning a new and total desolation and destruction, which would come upon the land, after ungodliness should there have regained the ascendency, and the good shepherd have been rejected; with this

difference only, that here the threatening is conditionally, and there absolutely expressed, since the Lord reveals to the prophet, that the condition of the divine judgments, the developement of the germ of ungodliness already existing in his time, would actually ensue, and the greatest portion of the people would not fulfil the condition of the prosperity by true repentance.

II.

Chap. 1 : 7—6 : 15.

The second revelation, imparted to the prophet in the same year, in the eleventh month and twenty-fourth day, consists of a series of visions which all belong to one night, and furnish a complete image of the future destinies of the people of God.

1. *The Vision of the Rider among the Myrtle Trees.*

Chap. 1 : v. 7 – 17.

In the stillness of night, when the soul, freed from the bonds imposed by external objects is strengthened for the contemplation of divine things, the prophet, not in a dream, but an ecstasy, sees a proud horseman on a red horse, who halts among the myrtle bushes of a deep valley, surrounded by red, bay, and white horses. He recognises, in the horseman in front, the angel of the Lord; in his companions his ministering angels. He asks an angel, who approaches him, and makes himself known as the *angelus interpres*, concerning the import of the vision. By his mediation he receives from the angel of the Lord the disclosure, that the horsemen are the servants of the Lord, who traverse the whole earth to execute his commission. For what object, he learns from the account which they render to the angel of the Lord, in his presence, and audible by him, since the *angelus interpres* has opened his ears. They have found the whole earth quiet and peaceful. From this account, which places the sad condition of the people of the Lord in a stronger light, by contrasting it with the prosperous condition of the heathen, the angel of the Lord takes occasion to offer an

intercession for the former with the Most High God, in which he earnestly inquires, whether, since the seventy years of affliction, destined by him for the people according to the prediction of his prophet Jeremiah, have long since passed away,* there is still no deliverance for them to be expected. He receives from the Lord a consoling answer. This is communicated by the *angelus interpres*, together with a charge to make its contents publicly known. They are as follows. The vengeance of the Lord shall overtake the nations in his own time, though they are now in a peaceful and prosperous condition, who have executed his commission to punish the covenant people, not from regard to his will, but to gratify their own desires, and at the same time with a malicious cruelty which went beyond his commands. In like manner also shall the promises made to the covenant people be fulfilled, although they seem to be delayed. They shall receive rich proofs of the enduring election of God; the building of the temple shall be completed; Jerusalem shall arise from its ruins.

The following remarks may promote a nearer insight into the import and object of this vision. It is very important in order to an understanding of this, as well as the following visions, to inquire whether the *angelus interpres* is identical with the angel of the Lord, or different from him. The former is asserted by the majority of interpreters (Mark, Ch. B. Michaelis, Rosenm.), the latter by Vitringa, with whom we decidedly agree. In favor of their identity the following arguments are urged. 1. Verse 9, where the prophet addresses the *angelus interpres* by "my Lord," the address must necessarily be directed to the angel of the Lord; since no other person had been mentioned before. But in this it is overlooked, that in the prophecies generally, and specially in the visions agreeably to their dramatic character, persons are very often introduced as speaking, or are spoken to, without being previously mentioned. 2. Verse 9, the *angelus interpres* promises the prophet a disclosure concerning the import of the vision. This, however, is imparted,

* Vitringa l. c. p. 17: "Est pulcherrimum Petavii aliorumque observatum, periodum LXX. annorum, decretorum punitioni Judææ gentis ad perfectum implementum prophetiæ bis repræsentatam esse. A quarto Jehojachimi usqeu ad initia Babylonica Cyri, quando dimissi sunt Judæi ex exilio, effluxerunt LXX. anni. Rursus totidem anni effluxerunt ab excidio templi et urbis, quod accidit octodecim post annis, usque ad secundum Darii Hystaspis: intersunt enim rursus inter initia Cyri Babylonica et Darii secundum anni octodecim."

v. 10, by the angel of the Lord, who must therefore be identical with the *angelus interpres*. But it is said, v. 9, "I will make thee to *see*, what these are." This relates to the opening of the spiritual eyes and ears of the prophet. Until this was done by the *angelus interpres* the prophet would not be able to understand the declaration of the angel of the Lord, and the report made to him by the ministering angels; comp. chap. 4 : 1, according to which the *angelus interpres* awakens the prophet, as a man who is awakened from sleep. 3. According to v. 12, the angel of the Lord presents an intercession to the Most High God for the covenant people. According to v. 13, the Lord returns to the *angelus interpres*, good, consoling words; but now it is not to be supposed, that he who receives the answer is any other than he who makes the inquiry. It may, however, here be assumed, either with Vitringa, that the prophet has only omitted the circumstance, that the answer was in the first place directed to the angel of the Lord, and afterwards conveyed by him to the *angelus interpres*, or, which is more probable, that the Lord directed the answer immediately to the *angelus interpres*, because the angel of the Lord had inquired, not indeed on his own account, but only in order to impart consolation and hope through the *angelus interpres* to the prophet, and through him to the people.

On the contrary the following arguments go to prove the *angelus interpres* to be different from the angel of the Lord.

1. Even the constant designation of the *angelus interpres* by "the angel, who spake with me," serves to designate him as a different person from the angel of the Lord. This would not be the case, if the designation occurred only where an address of the angel to the prophet had preceded. But its occurrence elsewhere also, comp. e. g. v. 9, 13, shows, that it relates not to a single action, but to the office of the angel, — *angelus collocutor* or *interpres*. In order to make the designation known as a name of office, the prophet employs it exclusively, without the smallest deviation, without ever exchanging the construction of the verb דבר with ב, for that with עם or את, elsewhere common, which may be explained by the circumstance, that the words were carefully treasured up in the mind of the hearer.

2. Chap. 2 : 5 – 8, is entirely decisive. The prophet there sees a form occupied in measuring the future circumference of Jerusalem. The *angelus interpres* withdraws himself from the prophet, in order to make inquiries for him concerning the import of the vision. But

he has not yet reached his goal, when another angel meets him with the command; "Run, say to this young man," &c. The identity of the *angelus interpres* with the angel of the Lord being assumed, the latter would receive commands in an authoritative tone from an inferior angel, which is entirely irreconcilable with the high dignity, in which he elsewhere constantly appears, and particularly in Zechariah. To this it must be added, that he, who measures Jerusalem, is, in all probability, the angel of the Lord himself. This being assumed, his identity with the *angelus interpres* becomes the more improbable, since the latter is with the prophet at first, and afterwards withdraws from him, to make inquiries about the vision.

3. It is remarkable, that a divine work or a divine name is never attributed to the *angelus interpres*, as to the angel of the Lord, that his agency is always confined to communicating higher commands to the prophet, and giving him insight into the visions, which are never through him, but always through the Lord, (comp. 2 : 3, 3 : 1,) presented to the inward contemplation of the prophet.

4. The result already obtained is confirmed by a comparison of it with what occurs in other writings of the Old Testament. We have already seen, Vol. I, p. 167, that, Exod. 32 : 34, another angel is associated with the highest revealer of God, the angel of the Lord, as standing to him in the same relation which he sustains to the Most High God. But what is found in Daniel on this subject is peculiarly important in the interpretation of Zechariah. The angel of the Lord, the great Prince, who represents his people, chap. 12 : 1, comp. Zech. 1 : 12, appears there under the symbolical name of Michael. As a mediator between him (who is present for the most part in silent majesty, and only sometimes, as here, speaking a few words) and the prophet, Gabriel appears, whose office it is to interpret the visions to Daniel, and enable him to understand them; comp. 8 : 16, 9 : 21. (Beitr. I, p. 165 ff.) We would already there have directed the attention to the accurate agreement between Daniel and Zechariah in this respect, the more remarkable on account of the manifest independence of both, if we had at that time, as we have been enabled to do since, attained to a certain result in reference to Zechariah.

The angel of the Lord halts on a red horse among the myrtle bushes, in a deep valley. The latter is a striking image of the Theocracy, — not a proud cedar on a high mountain, but a modest,

yet lovely myrtle in a deep valley. Similar is the comparison of the Theocracy with the still waters of Siloa, in contrast with the roaring waters of the Euphrates. Is. chap. 8. While outward splendor surrounded the kingdoms of the world, the kingdom of God was always small and obscure, and appeared, especially at that time, to be near its extinction. That the angel of the Lord halts among the myrtle bushes, indicates the high protection which the church of God, helpless in itself, enjoys. The import of the appearance of the angel of the Lord as sitting on a horse, and indeed on a red horse, we cannot better express than in the words of Theodoret: *τοῦτον ὁρᾷ ἐποχούμενον μὲν ἵππῳ διὰ τὴν ὀξύτητα τῶν δρωμένων, τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἵππου πυῤῥὸν τὴν κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων ἐθνῶν ἀγανάκτησιν δηλοῖ· ὕφαιμον γὰρ καὶ ὑπέρυθρον τὸ θυμοειδές.* Red is the color of blood; in red garments, Is. 63; the angel of the Lord comes from Bozrah, after he has crushed the enemies of his kingdom; on a red horse, Apoc. 6: 4, Satan appears, to whom it is given to take peace from the earth, that men shall slay each other, and who bears a great sword. By the color of the horse, therefore, is symbolized what the angel of the Lord, v. 15, says of himself: "I am inflamed with great wrath against the secure and quiet nations," comp. Is. 47: 6. The inferior angels, which surrounded the angel of the Lord, symbolize the thought, that all means for the prosperity of his people, and the destruction of his enemies, are at his command. The color of their horses signifies the judgments impending over the latter, about to be executed with victorious might. White is the color of victory; comp. Apoc. 6: 2; "And I saw, and behold a white horse: and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer." That the angels are sent to spy out the condition of the earth, and that they bring back the answer, that the whole earth is at rest, is designed to symbolize the thought, that it is now time for the accomplishment of the promises in favor of the covenant people, and the threatenings against their enemies. There reigned in the second year of Darius a general peace; all the nations of the former Chaldean kingdom enjoyed a peaceful and uninterrupted prosperity. Even the Babylonians (that to them the words, "the whole earth is at rest," principally refer, appears from v. 15. Jun. and Trem. appropriately remark: "*Delitias agit Babylonius et quisquis adversarius ecclesiæ, dum ecclesia tua maximis tempestatibus agitatur*") had soon recovered from the disadvantages they had suffered from the capture

of the city by Cyrus, which was still rich and prosperous. Judea alone, the seat of the people of God, exhibited a mournful aspect; the capital still lay for the most part in ruins; no protecting walls surrounded it; the building of the temple, which had been some months before recommenced at the exhortation of Haggai, had hitherto been obstructed by difficulties, which the dispirited people despaired of being able to overcome; the number of inhabitants was but small; the greatest portion of the land still lay waste; comp. Neh. chap. 1. This state of things must have been a great temptation to the pious; and have served the wicked as an excuse for their ungodliness; comp. Mal. 2: 17, where the latter inquire, "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?" and 3: 15, "Therefore we praise only the despisers, for the ungodly increase, they tempt God and all goes well with them." It required great strength of faith, under such circumstances, not to doubt either the truth of God or his omnipotence. His promises to the covenant people had only begun, and that in a small degree, to be fulfilled by their return; his predicted judgments upon Babylon extended much farther than to a mere capture of the city, and even this beginning of their fulfilment had apparently ceased, since the city was continually regaining its former prosperity. To counteract the temptations, destructive of all active zeal for the Theocracy, which this condition of things must bring with it, is the object of the prophecy. That the angel of the Lord appears as protector of his people, afforded them of itself a rich source of consolation. That he presented an intercession for his people, showed still more clearly, that the time of compassion was at hand. For his intercession cannot be in vain, nor the will of God unknown to him. By the answer, which the Lord imparts to him, must every remnant of fear and despondency be removed; it showed, that his promises and threatenings though gradually, and at the time determined in his holy and wise counsel, would yet certainly be fulfilled. We have now still to remark a few words concerning the fulfilment. Its commencement ensued even in the nearest future. The rebellion of the Babylonians under Darius the son of Hystaspes, brought the city near to its predicted entire destruction. Not to insist that it may be regarded as a consequence of the capture by Cyrus, it inflicted upon the city still deeper wounds. A great slaughter was occasioned and its walls were destroyed. The building of the tem-

ple was happily completed in the sixth year of Darius. The arrival of Ezra, and somewhat later, that of Nehemiah, who restored the walls of the city, and greatly increased its population, were a strong proof to the people of the divine mercy, and a sign of their enduring election. But we must not seek for the fulfilment in all its extent at this early period. The prophecies of Zechariah, like those of the earlier prophets, embrace the whole *complexus* of the salvation and of the judgments of God, with the exclusion only of what had already taken place, as, namely, the capture of Babylon and the return of the covenant people. What, therefore, is here said in reference to the anger of the Lord upon Babylon, and the remaining enemies of the kingdom of God, has its completion only in their entire destruction; what is said of the renewed mercy of God towards his people, in the sending of the Messiah. The beginning of the fulfilment in the nearest future served the people for a pledge of the certainty of its completion.

2. *The Four Horns and the Four Smiths.*

Chap. 2 : v. 1 – 4.

This vision also is of a consoling import. The prophet sees four horns, and receives from the *angelus interpres* the disclosure, that they signify the enemies of the kingdom of God. He then sees four smiths, who break the horns in pieces. The sense is obvious. The enemies of the people of God shall be punished for their crimes; the Lord will secure his feeble church against every assault. So far all interpreters agree; the number of the horns, or of the enemies, has, however, occasioned a multitude of arbitrary hypotheses. The true interpretation was seen even by Theodoret: *τέσσαρα δὲ λέγει, οὐκ ἐθνῶν τινῶν ἀριθμὸν δηλῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τέσσαρα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ τμήματα, τὸ ἑῷον, τὸ ἑσπέριον, τὸ νότιον, τὸ βόρειον, ἐπῆλθον δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ μὲν ἔνθεν, οἱ δὲ ἐκεῖθεν, ποτὲ μὲν Ἀσσύριοι καὶ Βαβυλώνιοι, ποτὲ δὲ Ἀλλόφυλοι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, ἄλλοτε δὲ Ἰδουμαῖοι καὶ Μωαβῖται καὶ Ἀμμωνῖται, τέσσαρα κέρατα τοὺς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων τμημάτων αὐτοῖς ἐπελθόντας προσηγόρευσε.* That the number of the horns relates to the fact, that the covenant people were surrounded by enemies on all sides, all quarters of the heavens, appears from v. 10; "According to all the four winds have I scattered you;" but still more clearly from chap. 6, as we shall there see.

3. *The Angel with the Measuring Line.*

Chap. 2: v. 5 – 17.

The symbolical apparatus is here but small. The prophet, like Ezekiel before him, chap. 40: 3, sees a form employed in measuring the future circumference of Jerusalem, since its present limits will not be sufficient when the city shall be enlarged by the mercy of the Lord. This form is in all probability none other than the angel of the Lord; that the employment is entirely suited to him, who, as the protecting Lord of the covenant people should accomplish this enlargement, needs no proof. His sending an inferior angel to the *angelus interpres*, and imparting commands to him, indicates a higher dignity than that of an inferior angel. We then have the advantage of an accurate agreement with Dan. chap. 12, where entirely the same persons appear in action, Michael, the angel of the Lord, in company with Gabriel, the *angelus interpres*, and another angel, (comp. Beitr. 1, p. 167 ff.) The *angelus interpres*, who had hitherto remained with the prophet, who was a somewhat distant spectator of the scene, withdraws himself from him, in order to receive from the angel of the Lord a disclosure concerning the import of his conduct. But scarcely has he departed, when the angel of the Lord sends him this disclosure by another angel, with the command to impart it to Zechariah. From the designation of the latter, in the discourse of the angel, as "this young man," the youthful age of Zechariah at the time has been justly inferred; but still there is certainly something else also as the ground of this designation. This was perceived by Jerome, who remarks, "*Ad comparationem dignitatis angelicæ omnem humanam naturam pueritiam vocari, quia non angeli in nos, sed nos in angelos proficimus.*" In like manner, Vitringa: "*Hominem brevis ævi multarum rerum imperitum, cœlestium maxime ignarum non tam contemtus, quam differentiæ causa appellat* נער, *et licuit dicere rudem, multa docendum, quo eodem sensu Ezechiel passim* בן אדם *appellatur.*" The interpreters have erred only in adopting exclusively one of the two references. The youthful age of the prophet is made prominent, because youth is a type of the condition of man in relation to God and his holy angels. What the other angel imparts to the *angelus interpres* for Zechariah, is as follows; the city shall be extended far

beyond its previous limits and protected and glorified by the Lord. This should excite all the Jews remaining behind in Babylon to a speedy return to their native land, that they may participate with their brethren in the promised blessings, and escape the judgments which the Lord has determined upon Babylon, and all the other nations, who have showed themselves hostile to the covenant people. Lastly, Jerusalem shall experience the highest exaltation from the fact, that the Lord himself shall make her his dwelling-place, the consequence of which will be, that many nations shall join themselves to the Theocracy when glorified by his presence. We have yet some remarks to make on this prediction. 1. "Flee out of the north country, deliver thyself from Babylon," v. 10, 11, points to a great calamity coming upon Babylon. That such a calamity actually fell upon the city under the reign of Darius the son of Hystaspes, we have already seen. With these words, v. 12, 13, are connected by the causative כִּי, since the general proposition, the annunciation that the angel of the Lord would punish the enemies of his people for their crimes, and indeed in such a manner, that they would fall under the power of Israel, as it happened in respect to several neighbouring people in the time of the Maccabees, constitutes the ground of the special direction which had preceded. Hence it appears with what justice some have denied the genuineness of the second part of Zechariah, because several nations are threatened in it with divine judgments, who in his time were subject to the Persians. If their independence could hence be inferred, so also could that of the Babylonians from this prophecy and the foregoing, and, therefore, even the first part could not belong to Zechariah. 2. The prediction of prosperity for Jerusalem here also relates in the end to the time of the Messiah. We must refer exclusively to this time what is said, v. 14, 15, of the dwelling of the Lord with Jerusalem, and the consequent pressing of the heathen nations to the Theocracy, as a splendid demonstration of the divine mercy, which, according to v. 17, all flesh shall behold with astonishment and wonder. That he, who will glorify the Theocracy by his presence, is the angel of the Lord, the sharer of his dignity and his name, who, according to the prediction of the prophet, shall appear in the Messiah (comp. Vol. I. p. 183), is evident from v. 15, "And then will I dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt experience, that the Lord of Sabaoth has sent me to thee." According to this, he, who will dwell in the midst of the covenant people, in like manner as he was formerly

present among them in the pillar of cloud and of fire, is the same, who, being now sent from the Most High God, brings to the people, through the prophet, this glorious message, and who, in v. 14, is called Jehovah, and is here distinguished from him as the ambassador from him who sends him. That he is identical with the Messiah, appears from chap. 9 : 9, where the arrival of the latter is announced to the people in almost the same words; here : "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion, for behold I come;" there : "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem, behold the king cometh unto thee."

Chap. 11 gives a further explanation, according to which the angel of the Lord appearing in the person of the Messiah among the people, with whom he had hitherto been invisibly present, and whom he had represented before God, undertakes to exercise the office of shepherd over them. While here, in chap. 9, only the bright side, there, in accordance with chap. 5, at the same time the dark side, the unbelief of the greatest part of the people in the manifested Messiah, and his rejection, is prominently exhibited. The reference of the prophecy to the Messianic times was acknowledged by the older Jewish interpreters in Jerome, as well as by Kimchi and Abarbanel.

4. *The High Priest Joshua before the Angel of the Lord.*

Chap. 3.

V. 1. "*And (the Lord) showed me Joshua, the high priest, standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to oppose him.*" The *fut.* with *vav convers.* closely connects this vision with the foregoing, and gives us one of a series of visions granted to the prophet in the same night. The subject in, "he showed me," is without doubt the Lord, as the Seventy and Jerome have already perceived. It is the most natural, because he had mentioned him immediately before, and indeed in a sentence with which the *vav convers.* connects. In addition to this is the comparison of chap. 2 : 3, "The Lord showed me four smiths." According to the common supposition, the subject is the *angelus collocutor;* but uniformly only the interpretation, not the presenting of the images, belongs to him. The expression הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל stands here, as v. 8, and chap. 6 : 11, with peculiar emphasis. It shows, that Joshua is not here considered according to his person, but his office; not according

to his private, but his public character. The phrase, "standing before the angel of the Lord," is, for the most part, misunderstood by interpreters. They regard it as a judicial expression; the angel of the Lord is supposed to appear as a judge, Satan as an accuser, Joshua as one accused. Considerable injury has thus been done to the interpretation of the whole vision. The expression, "to stand before any one," is never spoken of the appearance of the accused before the judge, but rather always of the appearance of the servant before the lord, to tender him his services and await his commands. Comp. e. g. Gen. 41 : 46, "Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh." 1 Sam. 16 : 21, "And David came to Saul and stood before him, and he loved him greatly, and he became his armour-bearer." 1 Kings 1 : 28, 10 : 8, Deut. 1 : 38. But the phrase is most frequently employed in reference to the service of the Lord; thus of the prophets, 1 Kings 17 : 1, "Elias said, As the Lord liveth, before whom I stand," Jer. 18 : 20. Of the whole people, 2 Chron. 20 : 13; but chiefly of the priests, for whose service it became a technical term; comp. Deut. 10 : 8, "At this time the Lord separated from the tribe of Levi, — to stand before the Lord, to serve him, and to bless in his name." 2 Chron. 29 : 11 : "My sons be not slack, for the Lord has chosen you to stand before him, to serve him, and present to him incense." Ps. 135 : 2, "The servants of the Lord who stand in the house of the Lord." Judges 20 : 27, "Phineas stood before the Lord at that time." Deut. 17 : 12. Accordingly the prophet here also sees the high priest Joshua, as such, engaged in serving the angel of the Lord, who, v. 2, appears under the name Jehovah, which belongs to God alone, and who, v. 4, ascribes to himself a work exclusively divine, the forgiveness of sins. Joshua implores his mercy for himself and the people, and presents to him prayers and intercession. Theodoret, *τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ πρεσβείας προσφέρων τῷ θεῷ*. The correctness of this interpretation is confirmed by v. 4, where עמד לפני in like manner occurs of the service of the Lord. The following also; "and Satan stood *at* (properly *over*) his right hand," is commonly misunderstood. Proceeding on the supposition already shown to be false, that a judicial trial is here represented, this has been referred to an alleged custom of the ancient Hebrews, for which, however, there is no proof, in accordance with which the accuser stood on the right hand of the accused. The

truth was seen by Werner in his valuable treatise,* *De Josua Summo Sacerd. ex Zach.* 3 : 8. Jena, 1741; "*Locus ad dexteram commodissimus est ei, qui alium in opere suo promovere vult, vel impedire.*" (Comp. Ps. 142 : 5; "Look, O Lord, on the right hand, I have no friend," &c.), *Amicus itaque a dextera nobis stat, ut nos eo melius juvet et protegat* (Comp. Ps. 109 : 31; "The Lord stands at his right hand, לימין, to deliver him from those who judge his soul." Ps. 16 : 8. Ps. 121 : 6); "*Inimicus vero ad dexteram esse dicitur, ut id quod in nobis firmum est, turbet ac debilitet.*" That by standing on the right hand in this passage, a violent and successful assault is signified, appears especially from the two parallel passages: Job. 30 : 12, "Upon my right hand rise the youth; they push away my feet, and they raise up against me the wages of their destruction;" and Ps. 106 : 9, "Set an ungodly man over him, and let an adversary stand at his right hand." In both, the על designates that which oppresses, prevents the action of the right hand, paralyzes all the efforts of the assailed. לְשִׂטְנוֹ is well explained by Tarnov; "*Ut sic nominis sui mensuram ab adversando Satanas dictus impleret.*" Rückert: "The enemy stands at his right hand to oppose him." The scene is accordingly as follows: the high priest is in the sanctuary, the building of which has been commenced, employed in supplicating the mercy of the angel of the Lord; who, in order to testify his good pleasure, condescends to appear in the temple, (comp. v. 7,) attended by a host of angels. Satan, the sworn enemy of the church of God, sees with envy the restoration of a state of reconciliation between her and the Lord. He endeavours to interrupt it by his accusations. The supposition of some of the older interpreters, (Kimchi, Drusius,) that Sanballat and his associates, who endeavoured to hinder the building of the temple, are here figuratively represented by Satan, needs no refutation. It is already shown to be groundless by a comparison of the prologue to Job, which Zechariah, who always imitates those who have gone before him, had certainly in view, compare also there chap. 1 : 10, with Zech. 6 : 5. This comparison is also important, inasmuch as it teaches us, what here belongs to the drapery and what to the sub-

* On the contrary, the prolix *Dissert. de Josua Summ. Sac.* of Zeising, *præs. J. G. Walch*, Jena, 1758, is worthless, and does not pay for the trouble of a comparison.

ject. In both places, and in the Apoc. 12 : 10, where Satan is called ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ὁ κατηγορῶν αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, the doctrinal import is merely, that Satan makes every effort to deprive the individual believer and the whole church of the mercy of God. That to this end he appears before God in heaven, or in the temple at Jerusalem, as an accuser, appertains only to the poetical, or prophetico-symbolical representation, whose essence requires that it should present spiritual relations in a sensible form to the contemplation. It still remains only to inquire, what means Satan employed, in order to build up a partition wall between the high priest and the angel of the Lord. What the Jewish interpreters have here invented, after the example of the Chaldee paraphrast, and which Jerome also incautiously received from them, is in bad taste. According to them, the ground of complaint was, the marriage of the sons of Joshua with foreign women. Nor is there any truth in the supposition of these Jewish interpreters, and several in recent times, as Eichhorn, Theiner, &c., that the accusation which Satan brought against the high priest was groundless, and that he was entirely innocent. It is contradicted by v. 3–5, according to which, the Lord forgives the high priest his sins, and, instead of his unclean garments, clothes him with those that are clean, the symbol of righteousness imparted through grace. The correct view is as follows. The high priest appeared here, as has been already shown, in the discharge of his office, and represented in some measure the whole people (Cyril : ὁ δέ γε ἱερεὺς νοηθείη ἂν ἀντὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ.) This appears, among other passages, from Judges 20 : 27, 28, where the high priest Phinehas says to the Lord, "Shall I yet again go out to battle against the children of Benjamin, my brother, or shall I cease? And the Lord said, Go up; for to-morrow I will deliver them into thine hand."

Just as, according to Lev. 4 : 2, the sins of the high priest were imputed to the people, "if the anointed priest sins to the making of the people guilty," לאשמת העם, — where Rosenm. had better left the interpretation of Le Clerc in its deserved forgetfulness, — so, on the other hand, the high priest appears before the Lord laden with the sins of the whole people, whose representative he was. Abenezra on Lev. 4 : 13, והנה הכהן הגדול שקול כנגד כל ישראל, "*Ecce pontifex max. æquiparatur universo Israeli.*" Compare other proofs in Herwerden, *De Sacerdote Magn. Hebr.* Gröningen, 1822, p. 9. This representative character of the high priest is, moreover,

here peculiarly evident, since the grounds whereby the Lord, v. 2, rebukes the assault of Satan, refer, not to him personally, but to the relation of the whole people to the Lord. It is only in this way, that the object and import of the whole vision are placed in their true light. The people after their return from exile, mindful of the grievous sins of their fathers, conscious of their own sinfulness, and beholding in what was visible only the first and faint manifestations of the divine mercy, began to despair of the same; they believed that God had for ever rejected the high priesthood, which he had established as a mediatorial office between him and them. This despair of the mercy of God must be attended with equally injurious consequences as false security. Among these, remissness in the work of rebuilding the temple, which has been unduly magnified by many interpreters, was only one, and that comparatively unimportant. Experience shows, that all fear of God ceases with despair of the forgiveness of sins, as the Psalmist of old expresses the close connexion between them by the words, "For with thee there is mercy and plenteous forgiveness, that thou mayest be feared." The prophet now represents the Lord, in a glorious manifestation of himself, not indeed, as lulling the people to repose in their sins from a false trust in their own righteousness, but as giving them the assurance, that, notwithstanding the greatness of their sins, he would of his free mercy continue as before the office of high priest, and accept his mediation until the time should hereafter come, when the true high priest, he, of whom Joshua was only a type, should appear and accomplish a perfect and perpetual reconciliation.

V. 2. "*And the Lord said to Satan; The Lord rebuke thee, thou Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, he who chooses Jerusalem. Is not this a brand rescued from the fire?*" Pelagianism, which is manifested also in the more recent interpretations of this section, appears in all its extent in Jarchi's paraphrase of the verse; "*Increpet Jehova te, ille qui elegit Hierosolymam, ut ne ingrediaris coram ipso justum hunc accusare; nonne dignus ille et purus, ideo ereptus est ex igne incendii?*"

It is not on the worthiness of Joshua and the people, but on his own election alone, on his compassion shown in the restoration of the people from exile, and which he could not now deny without contradicting himself, that the Lord grounds his rebuke of the accusation of Satan. Calvin: "*Hic prædicat deus gratiam suam, qua usus fuerat erga sacerdotem, ut statuant fideles fore Josuam superio-*

rem suis hostibus, quia deus opus suum non deseret; semper enim primis ultima respondent, quantum ad gratiam dei; neque fatigatur in ipso cursu beneficientiæ."

Still better Cyril; ὅμοιον γὰρ ὡς εἰ λέγοι, τυχὸν πεπλημμέληκεν ὁμολογουμένως ὁ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ταῖς σαῖς φιλοψογίαις ἐπισχημένος ὁρᾶται, πλὴν ἐκτέτικε δίκας οὐ μετρίως, ἀνέτλη τὰς συμφορὰς, ἐξεσπάσθη μόλις, ὡς ἐκ πυρὸς δικὸς ἡμίφλεκτος· οὕτω γὰρ τὰ ἐξ αἰχμαλωσίας ἀπεικονίσατο βλάβη, ἄρτι καὶ μόλις τῆς ἀνηκέστου ταλαιπωρίας διέδρα τὴν φλόγα, παῦσαι δὴ οὖν ἐγκαλῶν τοῖς ἠλεημένοις· θεὸς γὰρ ὁ δικαιῶν, τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; The verb גער, *to rebuke*, when spoken of God, who accomplishes all things by his word, receives the secondary idea of the actual suppression and defeating; comp. e. g. Ps. 106: 9, Mal. 3: 11. The construction with בְּ is explained by the fact, that the passion of the rebuker rests on the rebuked. The repetition occurs in order to subjoin the second time the reason; The Lord rebuke thee, and, indeed, rebuke thee on this account, &c. Comp. 6: 13. The election stands opposed to the temporary rejection during the Babylonish exile, comp. 1: 17. It had continued even during that period, but its manifestation had been prevented. This had recommenced with the return from exile, (comp. Rom. 11: 1 sqq.,) and no machination of Satan should hinder it any more. The expression, "a brand rescued from the fire," is taken from Amos 4: 11, "Ye are as a brand rescued from the fire," as a designation of a great calamity, which nevertheless, through the mercy of the Lord, has not issued in a total destruction. In the words, "the Lord said: The Lord rebuke thee," the Lord and his angel are distinguished from each other, and the latter is made equal with the former in respect to the divine dignity and honor.

V. 3. "*And Joshua was clothed in unclean garments and stood before the Lord.*" According to several interpreters, (Eichhorn, Theiner, &c.) the unclean garments signify the condition of the accused, who, among the Romans, thus appeared before a tribunal, and were called *sordidati*. But no trace of such a custom is found among the Hebrews; the interpretation rests on the erroneous assumption, that standing before the Lord refers to a judicial trial; it is inconsistent with v. 4, where, by the removal of the unclean garments, the forgiveness of sins is signified. Hence it appears, that the only true interpretation is that, which makes the filthy garments, according to the frequent usage of Scripture, (e. g. Is. 64: 5; "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteous-

nesses as a filthy garment." Is. 4 : 4, Prov. 30 : 12,) signify sins, with reference to the ordinance which required the high priest to appear before the Lord only in clean garments. The high priest, engaged in the service of the Lord, appeared before him, not in the purity required by the law, but laden with his own sins and those of the people. Satan sought to find therein the surest handle for his attack, but he deceived himself. The Lord, who had purified his people, yet not as silver, (Is. 48 : 10,) and who was satisfied, though the furnace of affliction had removed only the coarsest dross of sin, and had produced in the people the beginning of true repentance, a hunger and thirst after righteousness, which must not be stifled by severity, but nourished by being met with kindness, imparted to them of his grace, what they did not possess; he granted to the high priest, and in him to the people, the gift of justification.

V. 4. " *And he answered and spake to those who stood before him, Take away from him the unclean garments; and he said to Joshua, Behold I take away from thee thy sin, and they shall clothe thee with festive garments.*" As the filthy garments are a symbol of sin, so the putting on clean and splendid garments at the command of the Lord, signifies the imparting of forgiveness and justification. The interpretation of Mark is to be rejected, who understands by the symbolic action, and the explanation of it in the address to Joshua, not justification, but sanctification. It is only of the former that we meet with the phrase, " to cause sin to pass away," comp. e. g. 2 Sam. 12 : 13. In favor of forgiveness of sin also, is v. 10, (" I blot out the sin of the land in one day,") where the typical justification to be imparted to the high priest, and through him to the people, is contrasted with the full and perfect justification to be imparted through the Messiah. A similar symbolic representation of the forgiveness of sins is found in Is. 6 : 6. The prophet, on beholding the divine holiness, regards himself as undone, because he is unclean, and dwells among a people of unclean lips. " And then flew to me one of the Seraphim, and in his hand was a red-hot stone (fire, a symbol of purification), — and he caused it to touch my mouth, and said; Behold this touches thy lips, and thine iniquity is done away, and thy sin is forgiven." The verb ענה frequently stands where a silent address, question, or entreaty had gone before, and is then erroneously taken by those interpreters, who overlook this, in the sense, " to begin the discourse "; comp. e. g.

Gesenius, on Isaiah 14 : 10, where it ought to have been observed, that upon the entrance of the king of Babylon into Hades, an address to the shades there assembled was as much implied, as in the silent obeisance, with which any one enters into a company.* The meaning, "to begin the discourse," is the more unsuitable here, since a silent address and supplication of Joshua is already intimated by the immediately preceding, "he stood before the Lord." As often as the high priest appeared before the Lord supplication for the forgiveness of sins was implied. Those, who stand before the Lord, or before his angel, are his higher servants, the angels; comp. Is. chap. 6. These, in like manner, as in the passage referred to, shall adorn his inferior servants with the sign of forgiveness, which he only can grant. The *infin.* הלבש does not stand precisely for the *verbum finitum;* nor is the latter to be regarded by any means as left out. The *infin.* designates the pure action, without the person, number, or mode; comp. Ewald, p. 558. But here every thing depended on the action; the determination of the actors belonged to the foregoing address to them. This was the more properly omitted in the address to Joshua, since it did not appertain to the substance, but to the drapery; as his attention ought to be directed solely to the author of the forgiveness, not to the instruments which he employed as its symbol.

V. 5. "*And I said; Let them place on him, moreover, a clean turban; and they placed on him a clean turban, and put on him garments, and the angel of the Lord was still present.*"— The prophet, hitherto only a silent spectator and narrator, emboldened by love towards his people, here suddenly comes forward as one of the actors. Calvin: "*Consilium prophetæ, sacerdotem ita fuisse ornatum splendidis vestibus, ut tamen nondum omni ex parte constaret dignitas; ideo cupit propheta adjungi etiam mundam cidarin, vel tiaram.*"

Several interpreters suppose, that, by the bestowing of clean garments upon the high priest, the forgiveness of his sin, so far as he was a representative of the people, was signified; by the putting on of the clean head-dress, on the contrary, the confirmation of his

* The true interpretation was seen by Vitringa, on Zechariah 1 : 11; "Ad animum vocari velim, in omni casu, in quo vox ענה vel ἀποκρίνεσθαι usurpatur in exordio orationis vel narrationis absque antecedente interrogatione, semper interrogationem tacitam supponi, perinde ac in libr. sacr., ubi incipiunt a copula *et*, licet nihil aliud præcesserit, semper supponitur aliquid antecedens, cum quo historia vel oratio tacita cogitatione connectitur."

office. But this supposition is clearly erroneous, since the clean turban must symbolize the same as the clean garments. Moreover, it could not then be explained why the putting on of the turban precedes that of the garments, an argument which cannot be set aside by the ungrammatical explanation of Kimchi and others; "they placed on him the head-band after they had put on him his garments," in which the *fut.* with *vav convers.* is changed into precisely its opposite, a pluperfect. The true interpretation is rather as follows. The prophet designs to express the thought, that the Lord imparts to the high priest, and through him to the people, entire purity before him. This thought he thus symbolizes. The Lord gives merely the command to put clean garments upon Joshua. But, before this was accomplished, the prophet prays that the unclean part of the clothing of the high priest, of which nothing had been said in the command, might also be removed. His prayer is heard, and Joshua is now clothed anew from head to foot (hence the putting on of the turban precedes). The expression, "and the angel of the Lord stood," is well explained by Michaelis; "*ritum tanquam herus imperans, probans et præsentia sua ornans.*" That the angel of the Lord remains present during the whole action, and does not, satisfied perhaps with the command, commit the execution solely to his servants, is a proof of his high esteem and his tender concern for his people.

V. 7. "*And the angel of the Lord testified to Joshua and said.*

V. 8. "*Thus saith the Lord; If thou wilt walk in my ways, and keep my commandments, thou shalt judge my house and guard my courts, and I will give thee guides among these my servants.*" The cleansing of the high priest from sin, and of the people through him, is here followed by his confirmation in his office, including also a promise for the people, since the high priest was the mediator between God and them, and since the people could not be rejected, so long as the high priest in his official character remained acceptable to God. The opposite of what is here promised had taken place in the times of the Babylonish exile; comp. Is. 43: 27, 28: "Thy first father, (the high priest, as is evident from the parallelism, and from v. 28,) has sinned, and thy mediators have transgressed; therefore I profane the princes of the sanctuary and give Jacob to the curse." The judging or ruling of the house of God, signifies *supremam curam rerum sacrarum.* The guarding of the courts of the Lord, implies the obligation resting upon the high priest care-

fully to keep away every thing idolatrous and ungodly, first from the outward temple, comp. 2 Chron. 19: 11, 23: 18, Jer. 29: 26, then from the church of God, of which the temple was the central point. Here this appears, not as a duty, but as a reward, inasmuch as activity in promoting the kingdom of God is the highest honor and mercy which God can grant to a sinful mortal. In the words, "I give thee guides among those who stand there," the Lord promises to his inferior the aid of his higher servants. One can scarcely conceive, how this simple sentence should have been so frequently misunderstood. מהלכים is a Chaldee form of a participle in Hiph. instead of the usual מוליכים. Hiph. in the sense *to guide*, e. g. Is. 42: 16, "I lead the blind by a way which they know not." The explanation of Michaelis (Suppl. 557, 558,) "*Dabo tibi ministerium inter eos, qui hic stant, angelos mihi ministrantes,*" in which מהלכים is taken as plural of the noun מהלך, is liable to the objection, that the noun never occurs in the sense *munus* here attributed to it; and, besides, the reception of an earthly servant of God into the heavenly choir is an idea foreign to the whole Old Testament. We may be permitted to pass over other interpretations still more untenable.

V. 8. "*Yet hear, O Joshua, high priest, thou and thy companions, who sit before thee; for ye are types; for behold! I bring my servant Branch.*" The connexion with the foregoing is thus aptly given by Kimchi; "*Dicit, quamvis adducam nunc vobis hanc salutem, adhuc adducam vobis salutem majorem, quam hanc, tempore, quo adducam servum meum Zemach.*" We here, in the first place, institute an inquiry respecting the word מופת. It is commonly supposed, that the original meaning of this word is *demonstratio, ostensio;* we, on the contrary, affirm it to be that of *astonishment* and *wonder*, and, indeed, for the following reasons. 1. It is favored by the Arabic أُفْتٌ, أُفْتَةٌ, first, every thing that excites wonder, عَجَبٌ, then specially a calamity, which by its greatness awakens wonder and astonishment, (comp. Is. 52: 14,) أُهْبَةٌ (Schultens on Job, p. 423); neither of these senses can be derived, if *demonstratio* is assumed as the ground meaning. The assertion of Gesenius (Thes. s. v. אפת) that ת in أُفْتٌ is not radical, is erroneous. He grounds it on the combination of the أُفْتٌ with أُفْنٌ *calamitas, pernicies noxa*, from the root أَفِنَ. But the two words have nothing what-

ever in common. The word أوتن of itself, no more signifies calamity, than מוֹפֵת. Ps. 71 : 7. If this had been assumed as the original meaning, how could that of *wonder* flow from it? 2. Even the Hebrew usage requires the original meaning of astonishment and wonder. Since it is only from this, that all the senses of the word can be derived, particularly those in Ps. 71 : 7. The frequent combination of מוֹפֵת with אוֹת, far from proving, that both words are entirely synonymous rather proves the contrary; it shows, that both must be designations of the same thing from different points of view, and here, as is also shown by the comparison of other languages (*τέρας* and *σημεῖον*, *prodigium* and *signum*) scarcely any other reference is possible, than the double one, partly to the subjective perception, partly to the objective import of a thing. While the one narrator rendered prominent this, the other that relation, it could happen, that the miracle performed in favor of Hezekiah might be called in the book of Kings אות, in Chronicles מופת; from which it has been erroneously concluded, that both words must be entirely synonymous. But מופת is used especially of a thing or a person, which attracts to itself surprise and attention, because it typifies and predicts one that is future. This special meaning is found in four passages besides this. Is. 8 : 18, calls his sons, on account of the names prophetic of salvation, which the Lord had given to them, and thereby appointed them as types of the coming deliverance, signs and wonders (אוֹתוֹת and מוֹפְתִים) in Israel. According to Is. 20 : 3, the prophet, as a type of the Egyptian people, goes naked three years for a sign and wonder upon Egypt. Ez. 12 : 6, the Lord says to the prophet, after he has commissioned him to typify by his actions the future destinies of Israel, "For I have set thee as a wonder for the house of Israel;" comp. v. 11, "Say, I am your wonder, as I have done, so shall ye do; ye shall go into captivity." Ez. 24, the prophet's wife dies; in obedience to the command of the Lord, he durst not utter lamentations over her; the attention of the people is thereby excited to the highest pitch, they suspect that there is a deeper reason for the conduct of the prophet. They receive from the Lord the answer, "Ezekiel shall be to you for a wonder; as all that he has done, ye shall do," (v. 24, comp. v. 27.) In all these passages מופת corresponds to *τύπος τῶν μελλόντων*, with this difference only, that the latter exhibits merely the objective meaning of the thing, without regard to the

subjective sensation produced by it. This was seen by Cocceius: "*Viri portenti sunt illi, in quibus mirum aliquid, vel insolitum fit, quo excitentur homines ad cogitandum de promissionibus meis.*"

We now proceed to the illustration of particulars. By the companions of Joshua, who, with him, are summoned to attend, are to be understood his colleagues, the priests of an inferior rank. This appears, 1. from the object of the whole prophecy. Joshua is spoken of throughout, not as a private person, but as a high priest. He appears as occupied with the functions of his office; he is addressed even in this verse emphatically as a high priest. When, therefore, his companions are here spoken of, they cannot be such as were connected with him in any other relation, but only his colleagues in the priestly office. 2. The addition, "who sit before thee," leads to the same conclusion. This designates, not, as Michaelis erroneously supposes, the relation of the teacher to his pupils, but rather that of a president in a college to his associates, and, generally, that of a person of higher rank to his inferiors; comp. Ezek. 8: 1. Num. 3: 4, 1 Sam. 3: 1. The verb יָשַׁב is the *terminus technicus*, for designating the sessions of public officers, comp. e. g. Exod. 18: 13. Such sessions of the priests, when the high priest presided, were not unfrequent, comp. Lightfoot, on Mat. 26: 3. Lond. p. 517. The expression taken from these sessions was then in a general way transferred to the relation of the high priest to the priests as his subordinates. As here the priests are designated as companions of the high priest, so are they, Ez. 3: 2, as his brethren; "then stood up Joshua and his brethren the priests, and Zerubbabel and his brethren." כִּי, which has been variously misunderstood, gives the reason why Joshua and his companions are summoned to attend. They must hear the promise of the Messiah with peculiar attention, because as his types they stand to him in a more intimate relation, because their order will be glorified through him, since he perfectly realizes the idea of it. Much difficulty has been occasioned to the interpreters by הֵמָּה, inasmuch as it appears to refer exclusively to the companions of Joshua, while he himself, as the head, most completely typified the Messiah. This difficulty is removed by the remark, that the prophet makes a sudden transition from the second person to the third, as if he had said, "Joshua and his companions should hear; for they are," &c. This is evident from v. 9, where the discourse is concerning Joshua in the third person. Examples of a similar transition are very frequent, comp.

e. g. Zeph. 2: 12, "also ye Cushites, slain of my sword are *they*" (הם). Ezek. 28: 22, "Behold, I come upon thee, Sidon, and glorify myself in thee, and they shall experience, that I am the Lord, when I in her," &c. Jer. 7: 4. The second כי shows the reason, wherefore Joshua and his colleagues are אַנְשֵׁי מוֹפֵת. This lies in the appearing of the antitype. For if this is not real, then the type also ceases. This antitype, the Messiah, is designated by a twofold appellation. First, my servant, as Is. 42: 1, 49: 3, 5, 50: 10, 52: 13, 53: 11, Ezek. 34: 23, 24. Then צמח, sprout. This latter name designates the early obscurity of the Messiah; he will not resemble a proud tree, but a sprout, which gradually grows up and becomes a tree. This appears from the comparison of the parallel passages already collected, p. 5, &c. Among these, Zechariah, to judge according to his relation to these prophets elsewhere, in all probability had before his eyes especially those of Jeremiah (23: 5, 33: 15.) and Ezekiel. It is unnecessary to suppose, with several interpreters, that sprout here stands for sprout of David. The expression rather designates, in general, the early obscurity of the Messiah, not as Is. 11: 1, especially his origin from the fallen family of David, which is indeed a necessary consequence of the former. The assertion of Quenstedt is erroneous; "*germen est nomen originis et filiationis, — semper respectum habet ad id, cujus est germen.*" In Is. 53: 2, also, without respect to his descent, in order to designate his original obscurity, the Messiah is called a tender shoot, יונק in opposition to a stately tree. Calvin: "*comparat Christum surculo, quia de nihilo, ut ita dicam oriri visus est, propterea quod principium ejus contemptibile fuit. Quid enim obtinuit excellentiæ Christus in mundo, quum natus est, quomodo auspicatus est regnum suum? et quomodo initiatus est suo sacerdotio?*" The Seventy render צמח by *ἀνατολή*, which, however, they have not employed, as several interpreters erroneously suppose, in the sense of "a rising light," but, as Jerome, on chap. 6: 12, rightly perceived, in that of a *sprout*. In this sense they employ *ἀνατολὴ* (*τοῦ ἀγροῦ*,) Ez. 16: 7, 17: 10; the verb צמח is alternately rendered by them *ἀνατέλλειν*, *ἐξανατέλλειν*, *φυεῖν*, *ἀναφυεῖν*, and *βλαστάνειν*, Jer. 33: 15. They translate צמח by *βλαστὸς*, as does Symm. also, 23: 5, by *βλάστημα*, (comp. Mark exercitt. misc., p. 160 sq.) That by "the servant of the Lord, Branch," the Messiah was intended, was the prevailing opinion of the older Jews. The Chaldee paraphrases הא אנא מיתי ית עבדי משיחא דיתגלי, "behold I bring my servant the

Messiah, who will be revealed." In Echa Rabbati, Branch is cited among the names of the Messiah. In the Christian church also, this view was always predominant. Some of the fathers, nevertheless, (Theodoret on the passage, and probably, so far as can be ascertained from his obscure expressions, Eusebius, *demonstr.* l. 4, c. 70,) found here Zerubbabel led astray by a misapprehension of the words, "he will build my temple," in the parallel passage, chap. 6 : 13. For another reason, an earnest desire to set aside, as much as possible, references to the Messiah, this interpretation has found favor with some later Jewish critics, and with Grotius. Its refutation need not detain us long. A still stronger objection than that which is commonly and justly urged against it, — that צמח is a constant designation of the Messiah, and as such, occurs particularly in Jeremiah, the exemplar of Zechariah ; that here a *future* person is promised, while Zerubbabel had already long been active in the new colony, — is, that by it the whole object of the prophecy is defeated. Why does Zerubbabel appear in a prophecy which is occupied throughout with the priesthood ? How can his appearing be announced especially to them, as peculiarly honorable and joyful for them, how can it be contrasted as a higher blessing with the inferior one, the divine confirmation of their office granted to them before ? In what relation were the priests types of Zerubbabel ? In what sense could the removal of the sins of the land in *one day*, (comp. v. 9,) be attributed to him ? It now only remains to answer the question, in what sense the priests are here called types of the Messiah. It is impossible it should be any thing else than what constitutes the characteristic of their office. For that regard was had to the office, but not the person of Joshua, is evident from the circumstance that his colleagues were associated with him. The characteristic of the priestly office consisted, however, in the mediation between God and the people, and this in accordance with the circumstances of the latter, was exercised chiefly in procuring forgiveness of sins by sacrifice and intercession. The Messiah, therefore, can be represented as the antitype of the priesthood only so far as he should perfectly accomplish the mediation and deliverance from sin, which was but imperfectly accomplished by it. This is further confirmed by the following arguments. 1. We have already seen, that the people, troubled concerning the forgiveness of their sins, are consoled in what precedes by the assurance, that, notwithstanding their transgressions, the Lord would not reject the priesthood. When,

therefore, hitherto the priesthood has been solely considered only in reference to the deliverance of the people from sin, and when Joshua has appeared as occupied in procuring it, how can it be thought otherwise, than that the antitypical high priest here promised is contrasted with the typical, only in reference to the perfect deliverance from sin to be effected through him? 2. The Lord promises, v. 9, expressly, that he will remove the sins of the whole land through his servant. 3. Forgiveness of sin is a constant characteristic mark of the Messianic time, (comp. Vol. I, p. 199.) Zechariah, chap. 13 : 1, exhibits, as the chief blessing to be imparted to those who should look upon him who was pierced, that a fountain should be opened for them for all impurities and sins. But this passage derives the clearest light from Is. 53, where the Messiah is represented, at the same time, as the true sacrifice, and as the true high priest. As the latter, he sprinkles many nations (52 : 15); he presents a sin offering (53 : 10); he makes intercession for sinners, (v. 12.) The only difference between the two passages is, that here the method is, not as it is there, pointed out, whereby the true high priest shall effect the removal of sin. Finally, the Messiah appears as a high priest also in Ps. 110.

V. 9. "*For behold, the stone, which I have laid before Joshua, upon this one stone shall seven eyes be directed; behold, I will hew it out saith the Lord of Hosts and remove the sin of the land in one day.*" כי shows, that this verse must be the reason of the proposition immediately before; "for I bring my servant, Branch," in like manner as the first כי, in v. 8, and the second, must be respectively that of "hear," and "they are types." Appearances were altogether against the manifestation of the Messiah; the miserable condition of the new colony seemed to cut off all prospect of the fulfilment of such splendid promises, comp. 4 : 10. The Lord, therefore, the Almighty (Jehovah of Hosts), by pointing to his lively concern for the best good of the Theocracy, as the ground of these blessings, withdraws the attention from the outward appearance. That the seven eyes must not be regarded as belonging to the stone, but as directed to it, scarcely needs a proof, as is generally confessed by modern interpreters. It is sufficient even to refer to chap. 4 : 10, where the seven eyes of the Lord are designated as those, which look on the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel, and are cited as having been already mentioned in what had preceded. The eye of God is not seldom employed to designate the Divine Providence.

It is, however, peculiar to Zechariah, that he designates the most special concern of God for the stone by the resting of his seven eyes upon it. It appears, that he had here in view the symbolic representations of the Babylonians or Persians. That similar figurative designations were employed, particularly by the Persians, appears from the fact, that certain confidential servants of the king were called *ὀφθαλμοὶ βασιλέως*; comp. Suidas and Hesychius s. v., Brisson. de reg. Pers. princ. p. 264 sq.; a designation probably borrowed from their theology, as the whole Persian kingdom was supposed to be a visible representation of the heavenly kingdom of Ormuz, of whom the king was the representative, (comp. Beiträge 1, p. 125 seq.) It is further to be inquired, what is meant by the stone, to which the seven eyes are directed. It is almost unanimously supposed by the older interpreters to be the Messiah. But this is contradicted by "which I have laid before Joshua," whereby the stone appears as something already present only to be ornamented hereafter, as also by, "I will grave it." Others suppose it to be the foundation stone of the temple; but we do not perceive how this was to be graved. The correct view is rather, that the unhewn stone, to be polished and graven by the Lord, is an image of the Theocracy, and its seat, the temple, signifying its present low condition, and its future glorification by the Lord. The stone is then with entire propriety described as lying before Joshua, since, as had been said, v. 7, the chief oversight of the Theocracy, at that time, devolved upon him. The polishing and graving of the rough, precious stone, (comp. Exod. 28: 9, 11, 21, 36, 39, 30,) consists preëminently in the sending of the Messiah, though without excluding the earlier mercies of God. According to the cotemporary prophecy of Haggai, chap. 2: 7–10, the second temple was to be filled with glory, and made more illustrious than the first, through him. פַּתֹּחַ פְּתוּחִים, to open openings, to grave. The verb מוּשׁ, elsewhere intrans. *recedere*, here transitive. This land, Judea, which, although the deliverance from sin to be effected by the Messiah should extend further, even over the whole heathen world, is here alone mentioned, because in this whole prediction the prophet aims only to comfort the troubled minds of his people. The expression, "in one day," where day stands for the shortest portion of time, implies, that the removal of sin, to be effected by the Messiah, would not be continually repeated, like that accomplished by the typical priesthood, but completed in a single action.

V. 10. "*At that time ye shall call one to another, to the vine and to the fig tree!*" So translates correctly De Dieu, *Crit. Sacr.* More feebly others; "Ye shall invite one another under." The words contain an image of the rest, peace, and prosperity, ("*summa et lætissima tranquillitas in amœna omnium copia*," De Dieu,) which would be a consequence of the forgiveness of sins procured by the Messiah.

5. *The Candlestick with the Two Olive Trees.*

Chap. 4.

Between this and the preceding vision a pause is to be supposed. The *angelus interpres* had withdrawn for a time from the prophet, and the latter, his ecstasy having ceased, had recovered his ordinary condition of mind. Jerome: "*Quotiescunque humana fragilitas suæ relinquitur imbecillitati, deus a nobis et angelorum ejus auxilium abire credendum est.*" "And the angel who conversed with me," — it is said, v. 1, — "returned and awoke me, as a man who is awakened from sleep." We have here the deepest designation of the condition of the prophets while prophesying (comp. Vol. I. p. 217), in comparison with their ordinary state. They stand related to each other as sleep to being awake. The ordinary condition, in which, given up to sensible impressions, we are unable to raise the spiritual eye to the contemplation of what is divine, is that of spiritual sleep; the ecstasy on the contrary, when the senses are at rest, and the whole of our conscious agency ceases, and the images of divine things are represented in the soul as in a pure and smooth mirror, is a state of spiritual watchfulness. This sense, which is the only true one, Cyril alone among all the interpreters has perceived, who remarks: "Our condition, in comparison with that of the angels, is to be regarded as a state of sleep." The rest, as Theodoret, Jerome, Vitringa, have been led astray by their erroneous preconceived opinions respecting the condition of the prophets while prophesying. (Comp. Vol. I. p. 217.) They suppose the prophet was so absorbed in the contemplation of the vision, chap. 3, as to need the admonition of the *angelus interpres* to attend to the new scene which presented itself. But this supposition is untenable, since it leaves out of view, "and the angel returned," and indeed makes his going away to be without meaning.

The new vision, which now presents itself to the prophet is as follows; he sees a candlestick of pure gold, and on it an oil vessel, out of which the oil flows down into each of the seven lamps of the candlestick through seven tubes. On both sides of the candlestick, and rising above, stand two olive trees. The *angelus interpres* gives the meaning of this emblem, after he has reminded the prophet of his human weakness, and called his attention to the deep import of the vision by the inquiry: "Knowest thou not what this imports?" v. 6, 7, also in the expression, "This vision (so far as it was prophetical) is the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel; not by might and not by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts. Who art thou, thou great mountain before Zerubbabel? Become a plain! He brings forth the top stone (so is האבן הראשה to be translated, not, with most interpreters, *the foundation stone*, as this had already been laid many years before, comp. also v. 9, "his hands have founded this house, and his hands will also *complete* it,") * with the shouting (of the angels), 'Grace, grace unto it!'" Accordingly this is the import of the vision; the affairs of the Theocracy will not be promoted by human power, but by the Spirit of God alone, who animates, protects, sustains it. The immediate object for the accomplishment of which this general truth, at all times valid for the church of God, was here symbolized, was, to impart consolation to the desponding people and their head, and, thereby, energy for a zealous prosecution of the erection of the temple. For of what consequence was it, if whole mountains of difficulties opposed this work, since it did not depend on human power, which indeed was not at hand, but the Lord had taken it wholly upon himself? In this interpretation what is general and what is special appear in their true relation to each other, which has been misunderstood by most interpreters. Let us now see how the symbol and its signification are related to each other. The candlestick is an image of the Theocracy; the *tertium comparationis* the light, which both possess and radiate into the surrounding darkness, comp. Apoc 1 : 20; "The seven candlesticks are seven churches;" Luke 12 : 5, the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, &c. That the candlestick

* Unless one chooses, which appears to the author to be better, "he has brought forth the *ground* stone." But if, according to the current interpretation, the præter is taken as the *præt. propheticum*, the explanation given in the text is indispensable.

is entirely of the most precious metal, of gold, signifies the excellency of the church of God. The two olive trees symbolize the Spirit of God; the oil, which flows from them into the lamps and illuminates them, and causes them to give light, his influences on the church of God. The abundance of tubes, seven for each of the seven lamps, intimates the manifold ways in which the mercy of God flows to his church, as well as its exuberance.

It is commonly supposed that the prophet in the representation of the symbol has omitted through negligence, and afterwards introduces, v. 11 sqq., one circumstance, viz. that in the two olive trees were two boughs full of olives, which, lying in two *presses*, (so is צַנְתְּרוֹת in v. 12, to be explained, as is evident, among other reasons, from צָנַר, which cannot possibly be explained as it has been by many interpreters, by "near by,") conducted the oil to the candlestick. But this omission was rather from design. The mention of this special circumstance would have weakened the impression of the symbol as a whole, and have prevented the insight into its chief meaning. The prophet, therefore, does not direct the attention to this special circumstance, until he has learned and explained the import of the symbol as a whole. He asks, in the first place, v. 11, "What are these *two* olive trees?" This question cannot relate generally to the import of the olive trees, for the prophet has already been informed that they symbolize the Spirit of God. It rather concerns only the duality of the olive trees. But before the prophet receives the answer of the angel, he perceives that the duality of the olive trees is not of itself significant, that it has rather been chosen merely on account of the significancy of the duality of the boughs. He asks, therefore, without waiting for the answer, v. 12, correcting himself, anew, "What the two ears (Kimchi: *Comparat ramos olearum cum spicis, quod sicut hæ granis, sic illi olivis pleni essent*) of the olive trees, which are in the two golden presses, import?" And that he receives from the *angelus interpres* an answer only to this question, and not to the former, implies that the duality of the olive trees is not of itself significant. He receives for answer, "They are the two children of oil, which stand before the Lord of the whole earth." עָמַד with עַל, properly "to stand over any one," here signifies rendering service; near the Lord, who sits, stand the servants, comp. Is. 6: 1, 2, "The Lord sat on a high throne. — Seraphim stood over him," at his side, so that they appeared above him as he sat. The question now arises, who are the two children of oil, the

servants of the Lord, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. Several interpreters suppose them to be Zerubbabel and Joshua. But that these, considered as individuals, could not be meant, is evident, because the supplying of the candlestick with oil, the imparting of the divine mercy in the Theocracy, cannot be connected with the existence of two frail and dying men. Others, therefore, have rightly supposed, that by the two children of oil, the two whole orders were designated, which in the Theocracy eminently served as instruments of the divine mercy, the sacerdotal and the regal, or, generally, that of the civil magistrates. These alone could be called children of oil, in order to designate the official favor bestowed upon them by God, which was symbolically represented by anointing. Comp. in reference to the high priest, the important parallel passage, Levit. 21 : 12. That this was no longer practised in the case of the civil magistrates after the exile, is nothing to the purpose ; they were anointed in their predecessors, and the grace suited to their office, the thing expressed by the symbol, was continued to them. To assure to them and the high priests this favor, and through this assurance to console and gladden the people, who believed themselves forsaken of God, is precisely the object of the present symbolic representation. The spiritual and the civil government shall continue, as in the former Theocracy, to be the medium through which the Lord imparts his gracious gifts to his church. This promise in the highest and fullest sense was accomplished in the manifestation of Christ, who, according to chap. 6, should combine both offices, that of a King and High Priest in his person, whom the prophet represents, chap. 3, especially as a High Priest, chap. 9, as a King, and through whom the oil of the divine favor, immeasurably richer than that imparted through all former servants of God, is poured into the candlestick of the church.

6. *The Flying Roll.*

Chap. 5 : v. 1 – 4.

This vision, as well as the following, is of a mournful character. They show, like chap. 11, that it was by no means the object of the prophet to promote at all events the building of the temple, but that it was rather his principal purpose to bring the people to repentance and faith, which would necessarily be followed by zeal

for the outward work, which had been commenced. Excited by Ez. 2: 10, the prophet here sees a flying roll, twenty yards long and ten broad. Its dimensions coincide entirely with those of the porch of the temple, 1 Kings 6: 3. This cannot possibly be accidental, as several interpreters have supposed. The porch, the outermost part of the temple proper, was the place from which God was regarded as dealing with his people, in like manner as Solomon, 1 Kings 7: 6, judged the people in the porch of his palace. Before the porch, therefore, in the court of the priests, stood the altar of burnt-offering. In a great public calamity the supplicating priests drew still nearer into the porch, to embrace as it were the feet of an offended father; comp. Joel 2: 17, "*Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar of the Lord, and say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach.*" When, therefore, the prophet gives to the flying roll, the symbol of the divine judgment upon the covenant people, the dimensions of the porch, he intimates, that this judgment is a consequence of the Theocracy. A similar symbolic representation occurs, when, chap. 6: 1, the chariots, the symbols of the divine judgments upon the nations hostile to the Theocracy, go forth from between the two mountains, the symbol of the Theocracy. The roll is inscribed on both sides מִבֶּה וּמִזֶּה, exactly as the tables of the law, Exod. 32: 15, whence the expression is borrowed, and also as the roll, Ez. 2: 9, 10. On the one side, are the curses against those who abuse the name of the Lord by perjury; on the other, those against thieves (נקה in the sense *exterminare* in Niph. Is. 3: 26, in Pi. Jer. 30: 11, where the meaning *puram declaravit* is commonly assumed contrary to the parallelism.) The one stands as an individual example of those who violate the commands of the first table; the other, of those who violate the commands of the second; so that the one side of the roll contains the divine threatening against the transgressors of the command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;" the other against the transgressors of the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." This was seen by Theodoret: *Μὴ γάρ τις οἰέσθω κατὰ κλεπτῶν μόνων καὶ ἐπιόρκων, ταύτην γεγενῆσθαι τὴν ἀπειλήν· κατὰ πάσης γὰρ παρανομίας τὴν ψῆφον ἐξήνεγκεν· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ κρέμανται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, διὰ τῆς ἐπιορκίας καὶ τῆς κλοπῆς πᾶν εἶδος ἁμαρτίας συνή-*

γαγεν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ὅρκων παράβασις ἀσεβείας ἐστὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον, ἀγάπης δὲ θείας ἔρημος ὁ τοιοῦτος, ἡ δὲ κλοπὴ τὴν εἰς τὸν πέλας ἀδικίαν δηλοῖ, οὐδεὶς δὲ ἀγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀδικεῖν τοῦτον ἀνέξεται· περιεκτικὰ τοίνυν ἐστι τῶν ἄλλων νόμων ταῦτα τὰ κεφάλαια, καὶ εἰκότως τοῖς παραβάταις τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐκείνην ἠπείλησε. — This curse was to go forth over the whole land; it was not merely to strike the transgressors slightly and superficially, but entirely consume them, with all that belonged to them. In the expression; "It consumes their house, and its wood and its stone," is an allusion to 1 Kings 18: 38. We have here, therefore, a prediction of a more severe judgment of God to be inflicted upon Judea after the ungodliness, already at the time of the prophet present in the germ, should have taken root and put forth boughs. How this ungodliness will lead the people to reject the Messiah, and thus deprive themselves of the last means of their deliverance, is further unfolded in chap. 11.

7. *The Epha and the Woman sitting therein.*

Verses 5 – 11.

The *angelus interpres*, who had withdrawn for a while into the choir of the heavenly angels, returns to the prophet in order to explain to him the import of a new vision. The prophet sees a form as if rising from a mist, but is not able to recognise it. The angel instructs him; "This is the Epha which goes forth," not indeed, which is ungrammatical, "This, which goes forth, is an Epha." It is by no means necessary to suppose, with Jonathan, (*Hi sunt populus, qui accipiebant ac dabant mensura falsa,*) that the prophet alludes to *false* measures. Of this there is no trace in the text. The sense is rather: As the Israelites have filled up the measure of their sins, so also shall the full measure of the divine punishment overtake them. As a symbol of this thought, the Epha, one of the largest measures, was peculiarly suitable. That we are not, with several interpreters, to stop short at the sins, is shown by, "This is the measure *which goes forth*," which includes the idea of the divine judgment, as the comparison of v. 2, 3, shows. The exclusive reference to the punishment, attempted by others, appears however to be refuted by the interpretation of the angel, "This is their eye in all the land," i. e. it is the effort of the whole people to fill up the measure of their sins, and thereby bring upon themselves a full

measure of the divine punishment. And, though one could indeed give prominency only to the latter, they are intent upon nothing but to draw down the divine punishment with violence upon themselves, still a concurrent reference to the sins is manifest from what had gone before, where the Jewish people, personified as a woman, already sit in the Epha, before the divine punishment breaks in upon them. The word עין is not by any means *aspectus*, but *eye*, comp. chap. 9 : 1, "To the Lord is the eye of men," for, "The eye of the Lord is directed upon men." On a nearer view the prophet perceives that a woman sits in the middle of the Epha, v. 7. "This was (namely, what I saw, i. e behold there) a woman sitting in the middle of the Epha." She is designated by the *angelus interpres* as ungodliness, (comp. Mal. 1 : 4,) the ungodly Jewish people, who, as they had heretofore sat in their sins, were now to be surrounded by their punishments. Thereupon the woman in the Epha, in which she had hitherto sat upright, so that she appeared above it, is thrown down, and a great lump of lead laid upon her, symbolizing, that the Lord by his judgment would arrest the people in their sinful course. Two winged women appear, and with the swiftness of wind bear the Epha with the woman through the air into the land of Shinar. There the Epha is let down, and the woman receives her permanent dwelling-place. The women, no doubt, designate the instruments, which God will employ for the punishment of his people, hostile nations, as formerly the Babylonians. The duality belongs to the symbol, as such, not to the thing signified by it. For the carrying of so great a measure as the Epha, two persons were required. Great difficulty has been occasioned to the interpreters by the mention of Shinar, as the land into which Israel should be carried away. It has led Rosenmüller to suppose, that the prophet does not here predict the future, but describe the past, the carrying away of the Jews to Babylonia. But this supposition is entirely untenable. All other visions of Zechariah relate to the future, how should this only make an exception? Immediately before a future judgment is predicted, how then should this prediction refer to past times? And besides, the residence in Shinar, in v. 11, in contrast with the former, which was brief, is represented as of long, and indeed as of perpetual duration. Ignorance of the custom of the prophets, arising from the nature of the prophetic vision, to represent the future under the image of the past, and to call the former by the name of the latter, has led to these and other unnatural assump-

tions. Of this custom we have here a splendid and incontrovertible example, which serves completely to repel several attacks (which arise from ignorance of it) against the genuineness of the second part. The future dwelling-place of the Jews when driven out of their own land, the prophet here designates without farther explanation by the name of the country of their former exile, just as he does chap. 10 : 11, their future oppressors by the names of Ashur and Egypt.

8. *The Four Chariots.*

Chap. 6 : v. 1 – 8.

The import of this vision stands in close connexion with the foregoing. After, — such is its simple meaning, — Israel shall have been visited by severe divine judgments, equally fearful chastisements shall be inflicted upon the instruments, which God had in part employed in the punishment of his people; upon all nations from one end of the earth to the other. Here, therefore, the last general judgment is described, which, according to the unanimous prediction of the prophets, will follow the partial judgment upon Israel, and close the present course of the world. See further, on chap. 12, which is exactly parallel, as in general between the visions of the first and the prophecies of the second part a remarkable parallelism exists, which will hereafter be more fully noticed.

We now take a nearer view of the imagery in which this revelation is imparted to the prophet.

He sees four chariots, v. 1. With respect to their import, he is taught by the declaration of the *angelus interpres*, v. 5, "These are the four winds of heaven, which go forth after they have appeared as ministers before the Lord of the whole earth." The four winds of heaven serve as a symbol of the divine judgments. From their personification, the circumstance is explained, that chariots are attributed to them, and that these are afterwards identified with the winds, of which they are to be considered as the vehicles. The figurative representation receives light from some passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, whom the prophet seems here, as commonly, without prejudice to his independence, to have imitated. The divine judgments breaking in from all sides appear also, Jer. 49 : 36, under the image of the four winds; "And I bring against Elam the four

winds from the four ends of heaven, and I scatter them according to all these winds." In Ez. chap. 1, the judgments to be extended over all regions of the earth are symbolized by the four cherubim, over whose heads the Lord is enthroned, and whose chariots are driven towards the regions for which they have been destined; by the wind, the divine anger, or the divine sentence of punishment, comp. v. 12, as in v. 4; they come with a great storm from the north, to indicate that the divine judgment breaks in upon Judah from Babylon. Similar also is Dan. 7 : 2; "I saw the four winds of heaven strive upon the great sea," symbol of the whole multitude of the inhabitants of the earth, Apoc. 7 : 1; *Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τὰς τέσσαρας γωνίας τῆς γῆς, κρατοῦντας τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς.* The only difference is, that here, as in Ezekiel, the winds themselves do not ride on the chariots, but angels, who are placed over the winds and driven by them.

The chariots go forth from the two mountains, and these mountains are of brass. The judgment is hereby designated as a consequence of the Theocracy. The symbolic representation is to be explained from the geography of Jerusalem. Ritter, Erdk. II. p. 406; "a deep valley (*βαθεῖα φάραγξ, vallis profunda*) runs parallel with the Jordan from north to south, but after a course of some hours turns eastward towards the Dead Sea. It is the very narrow valley of Jehoshaphat, and the *wadi* in it is the bed of the brook Kedron, which lies dry a great part of the year. On both sides of this valley, above where it turns towards the sea, steep hills of limestone rise to different heights; three of their summits, on the east side of the brook, are naked on the eastern declivity, but on the western shaded with shrubbery, especially with olive trees, from which they have from the most ancient time borne the name of the Mount of Olives." That the prophet had in view particularly the valley of Jehoshaphat appears from the parallel passage, chap. 14 : 4, where, in a sense to be hereafter determined, an extension of this valley, by the cleaving asunder of the Mount of Olives, is promised. "And the Mount of Olives is divided in the midst, so that there is a great valley from west to east; and one half of the mountain falls back towards the north, and the other towards the south; and ye flee through my valley of the mountains, for the valley of the mountains will reach to Azal." As, in the passage before us, the discourse relates to the valley between two definite mountains; so there the valley of Jehoshaphat *κατ' ἐξοχήν* is called the Lord's valley of

the mountains. But why does the prophet, in order to designate the judgment as a consequence of the Theocracy, make the four chariots go forth particularly from this valley of the mountains? Because it lay under the Temple mountain, and was the nearest place to the Temple accessible to carriages, which was the dwelling-place of the Lord under the Old Testament. Here, therefore, (comp. v. 5,) the four winds of heaven stationed themselves, expecting the commands of the Lord. For a similar reason, because this place was the nearest to the temple, which was suited to contain a great multitude of men, Joel, chap. 4 : 1, represents the Lord as here collecting the heathen nations for judgment. "*For behold, in those days, at the time when I shall restore Judah and Jerusalem, I will gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage, Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land.*" On which Cyril of Alexandria remarks: *Χῶρος δὲ οὗτος οὐ πόλλοις σταδίοις ἀπέχων τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐν τοῖς πρὸς ἠῶ μέρεσι· ψιλὸν δὲ εἶναι φασὶ καὶ ἱππήλατον.* Wherefore were the two mountains called *brazen?* To indicate, that the Lord surrounds his kingdom with a wall of protection, which can neither be scaled nor broken through. This truth was symbolized by the position of Jerusalem, as the Psalmist had already expressed it in the words; "The mountains are round about Jerusalem, and the Lord surrounds his people." In order to make the type more conformable to the reality, the prophet converts the mountains, which cover Jerusalem on the eastern side, into brass. As for the rest, that the whole description is to be figuratively understood, and that the existence of the temple at the time of the judgment upon all the nations of the earth cannot be inferred, appears partly from this very designation of the mountains, partly from the foregoing chapter, according to which, before the coming of this judgment, Jerusalem shall be entirely destroyed and the people carried into exile.

The color of the horses is here equally significant as in chap. 1. It indicates the destination of the chariots to execute judgment upon the enemies of God, red the color of blood, black the color of mourning, white the color of victory. But here the circle of colors suited to the sense to be expressed was completed. The prophet, therefore, since no significant color remained for the horses of the fourth chariot, was compelled to give them an unmeaning color (speckled), and by a special epithet (אַמֻּצִּים, strong) to signify the attribute,

which, in the case of the others, was already implied in the color. Not perceiving this, the interpreters following Bochart (Hieroz. I. p. 111 sqq.) have invented a meaning (*purpureus*) for אמצים, in this passage, which it elsewhere never has, and is the less capable of receiving here, since it occurs, v. 7, in the usual acceptation *strong*.

After the prophet, v. 4, 5, has received, in reply to his question, information from the *angelus interpres* respecting the import of the four chariots, he describes, v. 6, 7, the direction, which in inward contemplation he sees them take. "The chariots with the black horses go forth towards the north country, and the white follow after them, and the speckled go towards the south country. And, as the strong went forth, they desired to go over the whole earth, and the Lord said, 'Go and pass over the earth,' and they passed over the earth." The difficulty here, which has given occasion to the interpreters for the most forced explanations, is, that the black horses of the second chariot are mentioned first, and that the red of the first appear to be entirely passed over. On a nearer inspection, however, this difficulty entirely disappears, the red horses of the first chariot are here *the* strong (disregard of the article is the chief cause of the errors of interpreters), those in comparison with which the rest were to be regarded as weak, although in themselves considered they were strong, and had before in part been designated by the same epithet; — the strongest among them. These are mentioned last, because, feeling their power, and not satisfied like the rest with any particular portion of the earth, they desire permission of the Lord to go over the whole, whereby it is intended to express the thought, that the judgment shall be strictly universal, no portion of the earth shall be exempted from it.

The chariot with the black and that with the white horses both go towards the north country. There must be a reason why this country is expressly mentioned, and two chariots depart for it. The inhabitants of the north country, — according to constant usage, the Babylonians and Assyrians, — had been in times past the most dangerous enemies of the covenant people. They, therefore, served the prophet, chap. 5, as a type of their future enemies. In order now to express the thought, that after the latter shall have returned again to the Lord, (comp. chap. 12,) the former shall eminently experience the divine chastisement, he makes the executioners of the justice of God go forth in a peculiar manner towards the north country. That the north country is here to be understood, not properly, but

typically, appears even from the foregoing chapter, where the prophet, not in a literal, but in a figurative sense, calls the country of those whose punishment is here announced, the land of Shinar.

About the same is true in reference to the south country. On the south of Palestine dwelt the Egyptians, the first oppressors of Israel, who were elsewhere also combined by Zechariah with the enemies from the north, as a type of the future enemies of the covenant people, (comp. 10: 10, 11.) That only one chariot departs for them, represents them as comparatively less guilty, since their misconduct from length of time now appeared in a less striking light.

The vision closes with an explanation of the Lord to the prophet concerning the design of the departure of the chariots. "Behold those, which depart for the north country make mine anger to rest on the north country;" comp. Ezek. 5: 13; "I make mine anger rest," and Zech. 9: 1, where the land of Hadrach and Damascus is represented as the resting-place of the divine sentence of punishment, which included in itself the fulfilment. The explanation indeed refers in the first instance only to one part, which, however, according to the above remarks, was the chief object of the divine judgment; but the prophet could easily hence deduce the destination of the rest sent forth under similar circumstances.

9. *The Crown on the Head of Joshua.*

Verses 9 – 15.

The future developements of the kingdom of God, which the prophet had described in the preceding context, the judgment, upon the former covenant people, as well as also, after their restoration, upon the remaining people of the earth, had their cause and source in the promised Anointed of the Lord, and presupposed his appearing. To fix the attention of the prophet, and through him that of the people upon this point, it is once more presented to his inward contemplation towards the close of his ecstasy, and with this, as the last words indicate, at once lovely and terrific image, the whole series of visions, whose collective contents in some way refer to it, is closed.

V. 9. "*Then came the word of the Lord to me:* (v. 10.) *Take of them of the captivity of Heldai, of Tobijah, of Jedaiah, and of*

Josiah the son of Zephaniah, who have come from Babylon, when thou goest into the house of the last named; (v. 11.) *take, I say, silver and gold, and make crowns, and place them on the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest.*" The prophecy presupposes certain historical circumstances, the knowledge of which is necessary in order to understand it. It appears, that the Jews, great numbers of whom remained in Babylonia, on hearing of the rebuilding of the temple, which had now been going on for five months, had sent deputies with pecuniary aid to Jerusalem. This does not indeed appear from the expression "of the captives," or of the exiles in v. 10. For הגולה, in the book of Ezra, is sometimes a designation, not indeed of those still in the exile, but of those already returned, commonly called the sons of the captives. It is manifest, however, from a comparison of v. 15. There the representatives of the "captivity," are described as a type of the distant heathen nations, who will hereafter actively promote the building of the temple or church of God. This type disappears, if by the captivity, the exiles, who had long since returned, are understood. וְיִהִי, "and when it happened," connects this vision with the foregoing; it was delivered to the prophet in the same night with the others, and contains a charge in respect to a symbolic action to be afterwards performed. With respect to the use of the *Infin. absol.* לָקוֹחַ, instead of the *Imperf.*, comp. Ewald, p. 558. As the verb is separated from its object by the full description of those from whom the gold and silver were to be received, it is once more repeated for the sake of greater clearness. נאת הגולה precedes the naming of the particular persons, in order to indicate, that these have not come *privatim*, but as representatives and deputies of a whole corporation, the Jews still living in the exile; just as in chap. 7: 2, Scharezer and Regemmelech appear as deputies of the Palestine Jews, ("The house, the church of the Lord sent Scharezer," &c.) and speak in the name of the whole people, ("Shall I weep," &c., v. 3.) This representative character of the individuals was important for the object of the prophet. Only in this respect were they suited to become a type of the heathen nations. — The interpreters, for the most part, suppose, that only three deputies had come from Babylon, and that Josiah, the son of Zephaniah, was the person by whom they were entertained at Jerusalem. They translate, "When thou goest into the house of Josiah, into which they have come," *quam ingressi sunt*, "from Babylon." But this is contradicted by

v. 14, 15, where Josiah appears as a partaker in the dedication of the crown, as a joint type of the distant heathen nations, who should build in the temple of the Lord. We must, therefore, translate אשר באו מבבל, "who have come from Babylon," and refer it to all the four who had been mentioned. The expression, "and thou shalt go into the house of Josiah," is i. q. "and from Josiah, into whose house thou shalt go." The reason why the prophet should go into the house of Josiah probably was, that he was the treasurer of the community, in whose house the presents which had been brought were deposited. In the view of the prophet the names of the deputies are as typical as their persons; he regards them as intimations of the attributes of those whom the persons typified, and of the blessings destined for them. This appears from the comparison of v. 14. There two of the deputies bear a name different from that which here occurs, but of the same import. חֶלְדַּי, *the robust*, from חלד = خَلَدَ *perennavit, sempiternus fuit, vegeta viridique senectute fuit*, is there called חֵלֶם, *strong*, from חָלַם, *to be strong*. Josiah, *God founds* or *sustains*, from אָשָׁה = אָשַׁשׁ, *fundavit*, from which comes אֶשָׁיָה *fulcimen, fulcimentum*, Jerem. 50: 15, is there called חֵן, *grace*. This variation is plainly designed; the easy remark *oportet hos homines binomines fuisse* of several interpreters is not a sufficient explanation, and the efforts to change the text rest on mere caprice. It is designed to show, that the names should be taken, not as current coin, but in their original worth. That the other names also, besides those already explained, — Tobijah, *goodness of God*, Jedaiah, *God knows*, *Deus prospicit*, and Zephaniah, *God protects*, — were suited to the design of the prophet, needs no further proof. On the phrase בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, Michaelis justly remarks: "*Die isto, quo scil. facere debes, quæ nunc mando. Forte deus in visione diem aliquem certum determinaverat, quem vero in visionis descriptione exprimere propheta minus necessarium duxit.*" — *Take silver and gold and make crowns.* The prophet should obtain as much of the silver and gold, which had been brought, as was requisite for executing the commission he had received from the Lord. There is a difference among the interpreters with reference to the number of the crowns to be made. The common opinion is in favor of two, in support of which, it is said, that this number is required to make the type correspond with the following prophecy, which announces the union of the high-priestly and the regal dignity in the person

of the Messiah, and with the reality. But against this argument Mark has already very justly objected: "*Ad sacerdotium cogitandum non ducit heic corona, sed persona et munus Josuæ.*" We cannot perceive, why that should be made the subject of an additional type, which Joshua, as has been said, chap. 3, already typified himself. Besides, we find no trace of two crowns, certainly not in the duality of the metals, which might just as well be applied to one as to more. Lastly, the question still arises, whether the name crown, עֲטָרָה, can be given to the head-dress of the high priest, which, to say the least, it receives nowhere else. The choice, therefore, can be only between two views, either that but one, or that several crowns were made. The latter cannot indeed be sustained by the plural עֲטָרוֹת. For this is sufficiently explained by the supposition of one consisting of several small crowns or diadems. It occurs entirely in this sense, Job 31: 36, "*I will bind it around me as crowns,*" where only one *complex* crown can be spoken of, as also Apoc. 19: 12; (*καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ διαδήματα πολλά*), where not several separate diadems, but one composed of many, is attributed to Christ, as the mark of his regal dignity. The idea of *one* crown is favored partly by the unsuitableness and insipidity of a plurality, partly by its being placed on the head of one, Joshua, and partly by the connexion of the sing. of the verb תִּהְיֶה with the plur. עטרות, v. 14; which, however, of itself would not be decisive, (comp. Ewald, p. 639.) — Thus far the prophecy by matters of fact expressed by the symbolic action. Let us now inquire, how far this could be intelligible to Joshua and his enlightened contemporaries, even without the following verbal prophecy. The putting on of the crown manifestly signified the conferring of the royal dignity. Hereby, therefore, the thought was forbidden, that the prophecy by matters of fact could refer to his person as such. Never could the kingdom be taken from the house of David without a violation of the promises which God had made to him. Joshua, therefore, could not doubt that the crown was placed upon him only as the type of another. Who this was, he had the less reason to doubt, since he had just before, chap. 3, been greeted as a type of the Messiah, since, according to Ezek. 21: 31, &c., the diadem and crown should be taken from the royal stock, until they should be conferred upon the Messiah, and as David, Ps. 110, had already predicted, that the priesthood of the Messiah should be like that of Melchisedech, that he should unite in himself the dignity of high

priest and king. All possible uncertainty, however, was done away by the following verbal prophecy. This was designed to explain the foregoing symbolic action in two respects; first, what was intended by the placing of the crown upon the head of Joshua, and, secondly, why the material of this crown was taken from the deputies and representatives of brethren, who were dwelling in distant lands. V. 12, 13, relate to the former, v. 14, 15, to the latter.

V. 12. "*And say to him, thus saith the Lord: see there a man whose name is Branch; out of his ground shall he spring forth, and build the temple of the Lord.*" The prophecy is here placed after the synonymous symbolic action, as if independent of it. The particle הִנֵּה points to the Messiah as present, and admonishes Joshua, who represents him in name and office, to direct towards him his spiritual eye. The manner in which the appellation צֶמַח is here employed, as a sort of proper name of the Messiah, yet, as the context shows, with a close regard to its appellative import, points back to the earlier prophecies, especially those of Jeremiah, (comp. on chap. 3,) in which the Messiah had been represented as a sprout of David to be raised up by the Lord. The phrase מִתַּחְתָּיו יִצְמָח is to be translated, *desubter se germinabit*. It contains the explanation of צֶמַח. The great subject of promise will justly bear the name *branch* or *sprout*. For he will not descend from above in full glory, but, like a plant slowly springing up from the ground beneath, raise himself by degrees from his original obscurity. According to this explanation, מִתַּחַת stands opposed to מִמַּעַל, just as e. g. Exod. 20: 4; "Thou shalt make to thyself no likeness of that which is in heaven above, מִמַּעַל, and of that which is on the earth beneath, מִתַּחַת," and Amos. 2: 9. Correctly, Drusius: "*Germen vocatur, quia ex se repente succrescet, et ex radice sua in similitudinem germinis pullulabit.*" The explanation of others is to be rejected, who give to the verb יִצְמָח another subject than the Messiah, as Luther: "*Under him it will grow;*" Calovius: "*Sub eo et ejus regno germinabunt et florebunt omnia;*" Burk: "*Germen est ipse, et sub illo opus quoque universum pulchre germinabit;*" Jerome: "*Et subter eum orietur multitudo credentium,*" Cyril, &c. It is an unsuitable image, that under the sprout, therefore, out of its roots, all, or the multitude of believers, shall grow. This growth does not appear till the shoot becomes a great tree, under which Ezekiel in the parallel prophecy, chap. 17: 22–24, makes all the fowls of heaven dwell; the substitution of another subject than the noun

immediately preceding is unnatural ; the parallel passage of Jeremiah, which the prophet had just had before his eyes, chap. 33 : 15, " Behold I make a righteous sprout spring forth to David," shows, that as the Messiah is there he whom the Lord causes to spring up, so is he here the sprout itself. Another explanation, " He will sprout up out of his own place " (Alting : " *e loco suo, tum quod ad gentem, ex domo Davidis, Judæ, Abrahami, quibus factæ sunt promissiones, tum quod ad patriam* ; " Tarnov, Reuss, &c.,) takes מִתַּחְתָּיו as simply synonymous with מְקֹמוֹ, as it has already been explained by Kimchi and Abenezra, but erroneously, since תַּחַת in the Hebrew, as well as in all the kindred dialects, never has the meaning *place*, but always, if the passages are accurately examined, that of *below*. It deprives the explanation of צֶמַח of an essential characteristic, the original obscurity of the Messiah, and introduces in its stead one foreign to the purpose. It diminishes in this manner the force of the contrast with the following member, which consists in this, that he, who at first appears in obscurity, will so build the temple of the Lord, that every former building of it shall be comparatively nothing. — *He builds the temple of the Lord.* That the building of the outward temple cannot here be spoken of, as the Jewish interpreters dream, has been well proved by Reuss in the learned *Dissert., qua orac.* Zach. 6 : 12, 13. *expl., Opuscc. t.* I. p. 1 – 156. Nowhere is a building of the outward temple attributed to the Messiah. Our prophet had himself declared in the name of God, chap. 4 : 10, that the building of the temple begun by Zerubbabel, should also be completed by him ; and this same temple, according to his predecessor Haggai, chap. 2 : 7 – 9, and his successor, Mal. 3 : 1, should be glorified by the presence of the Messiah. The building of the temple and the high priesthood of the Messiah must still stand in a certain relation to each other. If now the purity to be effected by the latter is not outward, but inward ; if, as our prophet from his zealous study of his predecessors, (comp. Is. 53,) must have known, and according to chap. 12 and 13, actually did know, this purity was to be obtained, not by the blood of animals, but by the high priest's own blood, then surely must the prophet, when he is led by the building of the temple in his time to attribute such a work to the Messiah, be understood figuratively ; and the more so, since, as we have already had frequent occasion to show, it is his constant custom to rise from the shadow of future blessings to the blessings themselves, and to repre-

sent the future under the image, and by the name, of the present. — It is further to be observed, that it is not here asserted, that the Messiah would build *a* temple to the Lord, but *the* temple of the Lord. The temple is thus designated as perpetually existing, as constantly the same; it is, however, to be exalted by the Messiah to a glory never anticipated before. We now inquire, in what sense the building of the temple is attributed to the Messiah. The temple was the seat of the kingdom of God under the Old Testament; it is this, not the walls or any thing else of an outward nature, which constituted the essence of the idea. Thereby, however, was it suited for an image and type of the kingdom of God itself, the church, which by no means began with Christ, but, under the Old and New Testament, is one and the same. Cocceius: "*Templum autem dei unum est, nempe ecclesia τῶν σωζομένων, inde a promissione in paradiso promulgata, usque ad finem mundi.*" This temple Solomon and Zerubbabel had contributed to build, so far as their outward efforts proceeded from faith, and were not directed to what was external as such, not to the shell but to the kernel, which remained when the shell had long been broken.

V. 13. "*And he will build the temple of the Lord, and he will bear majesty; and he sits and reigns on his throne, and is a priest on his throne and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.*" The repetition of, "*and he will build the temple,*" is by no means an idle one. As these words, v. 12, in the antithesis with "he will spring out of the earth," direct the attention to the fact, that a glorification of the kingdom of God, never anticipated before, would proceed from the Messiah, notwithstanding his original obscurity, so do they here, as the והוא repeated in both sentences shows, closely relate to the following, "and he will bear majesty." They call the attention to the circumstance, that the building of a far superior temple, an infinitely greater glorification of the Theocracy, was to be expected from the Messiah clothed with majesty, than from the poor and obscure Zerubbabel. They thus opened for those who were mourning over the feeble and small beginning of the new colony a rich fountain of consolation; they raise their view from the poor present to the splendid future. — The words, "he will bear majesty," contain the explanation of the putting on of the crown in the symbolic action. The noun הוֹד stands by way of eminence for the kingly majesty, comp. 1 Chron. 29:25; "And the Lord made Solomon great, and bestowed upon him kingly maj-

esty and glory, הוֹד מַלְכוּת, which no king possessed before him;" Dan. 11: 25, "They bestow not upon him the kingly majesty," הוֹד מַלְכוּת; Ps. 21: 6, 8: 6, where man appears as a subordinate king appointed by God; and that in this special meaning the word is to be taken here also, appears from the reference to the symbolic action and from the context. Several translate, "He will receive majesty," and especially has Reuss given himself much trouble to defend this interpretation. But majesty and dominion are elsewhere also often represented as something borne by rulers, upon their heads, with reference to the badge of the regal dignity, the crown, comp. e. g., besides the cited passages of Chron., Dan., and Ps., Num. 27: 20; "Thou bestowedst of thy majesty, מֵהוֹדְךָ, upon him;" and this representation was here the more natural, as the prophet had before him Joshua, bearing on his head the crown, the badge of dominion. "He sits," and "he reigns," differ from each other in this, that the former signifies the possession of the regal honor and dignity, the latter the actual exercise of the regal power. — The *suff.* in כִּסְאוֹ is referred by several, especially Vitringa, *Obss. s.* 1, p. 317, and Reuss ("*ita in solium Jehovæ exaltatum iri, ut non modo divinæ illius majestatis et gloriæ particeps sit, sed actu etiam imperium ipse administret,*") to Jehovah. But this interpretation plainly originated in over fondness for emphasis, which is too often manifest in the otherwise estimable treatise of Reuss. The close relation is thus overlooked, in which the first עַל־כִּסְאוֹ stands with the second. This relation shows, that the emphasis does not rest on the *suff.*, that the object of the prophet is rather, to render prominent the thought, that the Messiah would be both a king and high priest on one and the same throne. This truth, however, was in the highest degree consoling to the covenant people. It gave them a pledge, that their future head should possess both the power and the will to help them. As a true high priest, the Messiah should represent his people before God, and procure for them forgiveness of their sins, as the prophet had already more fully predicted, chap. 3; as a true king, of whose glory all who had preceded were only a feeble copy, he should protect the objects of his favor, and, in general, make them partakers of all the blessings designed for them by God. — In the last words there is a difference in the interpretation, first, of the phrase "between them both." Very ancient (even Jerome mentions it), and widely spread (Cocceius, Vitringa, Bengel, Reuss, &c.) is the interpretation, "*inter germen et Jehovam.*" On the con-

trary, a still greater number of interpreters, (Jerome, Mark, Michaelis, &c.,) refer the phrase, "between both," to the two offices or persons of high priest and king united in the Messiah. This latter interpretation is clearly to be preferred. The objection, that the king was not expressly mentioned in the foregoing context, is of no importance, as the Messiah had been plainly enough designated as a king. The distinction between him as king and as high priest is the less strange, since a reference to the earlier Theocracy plainly lies at the foundation, where the two offices united in the Messiah were administered by two persons. Mark cites as analogous, the distinction between the inward and outward, the old and the new man. It is decisive in favor of this interpretation, that only according to it do the words stand in an apposite relation to the chief object of the whole prophecy, the union of the kingly and the high-priestly office in the Messiah; but, in addition to this, the *two* must necessarily be the last mentioned, so that only according to the false reference of the *suff.* in יִבְנֶה can Jehovah be regarded as belonging to them. — A second difference occurs in the interpretation of עֲצַת שָׁלוֹם. After Jerome, ("*Et consilium pacificum erit inter utrumque, ut nec regale fastigium sacerdotalem deprimat dignitatem, nec sacerdotii dignitas regale fastigium, sed in unius gloria domini Jesu utrumque consentiat,*") several, as Michaelis, ("*Bene eis convenict suavis inter utrumque concordia erit*") refer these words to the harmony of these two offices united in the Messiah, in contrast with the discordance which often formerly occurred to the injury of the Theocracy, when they were administered by different persons. Others, on the contrary, take שָׁלוֹם as *gen. objecti: consilium de pace comparanda, conferenda, conservanda.* This interpretation is plainly the true one. The first takes עֵצָה, "counsel, deliberation," in the sense "disposition," which is entirely untenable. Altogether similar is Is. 53: 5, מוּסַר שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ, "the chastisement, which has our peace for its object," and Zech. 8: 16, מִשְׁפַּט שָׁלוֹם שִׁפְטוּ, which Jerome rightly explains: "*Hoc est judicium pacis, ut propositum judex habeat pacificare discordes, juxta illud Evangelii: Beati pacifici.*" The prophet, therefore, represents the Messiah as king, and the Messiah as high priest, devising the best method and way to secure peace and prosperity to the covenant people. If at the present time the common effort of Zerubbabel and Joshua, which was only a feeble type, to promote the best interests of the Theocracy, had been attended with happy results, what

might be expected when the true high priest and the true king, the Messiah, should strive with anxious care for this object, when he should employ all the means which these two dignities united in himself supplied.

V. 14. "*And the crowns shall be to Helem, and to Tobijah, and to Jedaiah, and to Hen, the son of Zephaniah, for a memorial in the temple of the Lord.*" The prophet here proceeds to explain the other point of the symbolic action, the circumstance that the material of the crown had been received from the deputies and representatives of the Jews, who dwelt far from their native land. The crown should be to these for a memorial, not, as is shown by what follows, on account of their personal, but their typical quality, so far as each one at the sight of the crowns would call to mind, that those, who had consecrated them, in reality and name typified the heathen, who hereafter, as *they* had done now, hastening from distant lands, would make every effort with the greatest readiness in order to adorn the temple, to promote the kingdom of God. — Whether the action here commanded to the prophet in vision was afterwards actually performed by him outwardly is extremely doubtful, however positively Hülsemann (*Vir Zemach*, in the *Thes. Theol. Phil.* I., p. 1005 sqq.) asserts it. Certainly the account of the Talmudist, (Middoth 3, 8,) respecting the place, where the crown was hung up in the temple, can prove nothing. The opposite opinion is in a measure favored by v. 11, where the prophet, who was hardly a goldsmith, is commanded to make the crowns, which can indeed, if necessary, be understood of causing them to be made. A far stronger argument, however, is drawn from the prevailing fondness of Zechariah for what is internal, which, in his case, as in that of Ezekiel, awakens a prejudice against the outward representation, which can be set aside only by weighty reasons, and especially from the analogy of the other symbolic action, chap. 11, which was certainly performed only in inward contemplation, to which also all the remaining visions of this portion were confined.

V. 15. "*And they that are far off shall come and build in the temple of the Lord; and ye shall know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me unto you, and if ye will hearken to the voice of the Lord your God, so*" ..... How the participation of those who were distant, the heathen in distant lands, comp. 2: 11, 8: 20, Is. 60: 9, 10, and other passages, in the building of the temple is to be understood, needs no particular illustration after what has been said respecting the building of the temple by the Messiah. If we looked merely at

this passage, we might be induced to take the words, "and ye shall know," &c., as words of the prophet; but the comparison of chap. 2:9, 11, and chap. 4:9, where they are spoken by the angel of the Lord, through whom the prophet receives his revelations, shows, that here also they belong to him; and this supposition is the more natural, since the prophet, v. 12, expressly introduces as speaking Jehovah of Hosts, as the angel of the Lord in the former passage also is called. The result, the active participation of the heathen in building up the kingdom of God, should in the future furnish a proof of the divine origin of both the symbolical and the verbal prediction. — The last words have been erroneously understood in various ways, Jerome. "*Fient autem omnia, quæ promissa sunt, si dominum audire voluerint, et acta pœnitentia in bonis operibus manserint.*" Theodoret: *Ταῦτα δέ, φησιν, ἔσται, καὶ τὸ προσῆκον δέξεται πέρας, ἐὰν ὑμεῖς τοῖς θείοις ὑπακούσητε λόγοις.* According to this, the appearing of the Messiah, and especially the participation of the heathen in his kingdom, are connected with a condition, the faithfulness of the covenant people; but this is without example, and absurd. To avoid this difficulty, others, as Mark, refer וְהָיָה merely to the immediately preceding declaration: "This, — viz. that ye will see from the result that I have been sent by God, — will come to pass if ye will obey the Lord." But this removes the difficulty only in appearance. For, "ye shall know," is in substance i. q. "ye shall have opportunity to know;" and was true even of those who wilfully shut their eyes. But the omission of the pronoun should of itself have led the interpreters to another explanation, to the supposition of an *aposiopesis*, which gives a peculiarly emphatic sense. Comp. similar examples, besides the entirely analogous one in Zechariah himself, chap. 7:7, 2 Sam. 2:27, 5:8; in the New Testament, e. g. Luke, 13:9; *κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπόν, εἰ δὲ μήγε, εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν.* Weiner, Gramm. Aufl. 3, p. 478. And this is the more natural, as it is one of the peculiarities of Zechariah, to use וְהָיָה far oftener than any other prophet as a mere prelude. "If ye will hearken to the voice of the Lord, so, — ye shall have a part in all these blessings, so will the Messiah deliver you from sin as your high priest, and make you happy as your king." With this earnest word of admonition the angel of the Lord closes at the same time this particular revelation, and the whole connected series of revelations, which, in this memorable night, he imparts to the people through our prophet.

We have yet to give a sketch of the history of the interpretation of this prophecy. In the more ancient writings of the Jews we still find traces of the prevalence of the Messianic interpretation. The Chaldee Paraphrase introduces it into the translation: הא גברא משיחא שמיה עתיד דיתגלי ויתרבי. "Behold there the man, Messiah is his name, he will be revealed and glorified." In Breschit Rabba, (comp. Vol. I. p. 485,) in Raim. Martini, pp. 155, 759, it is said: "R. Barachias brings forward this: God says to the Israelites: Ye say to me, we are orphans and have no father; the Goel also, whom I will raise up to you, has no father, as Zech. 6: 12; Behold it is a man by name Branch, who will spring up from under himself. And so says Is. 53: 3; He shoots up before him as a sprout." In Echa Rabbati, an old commentary, or a sort of *catena*, on the Lamentations, it is said, in the enumeration of the names of the Messiah in Raim. Mart. p. 880, "Joshua Ben Levi said, He is called sprout, as it is said, 6: 12;" comp. other passages in Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* II. p. 219 sqq. 104, 422. His *Jesus der wahre Messias*, p. 402. Still it must not be overlooked, that before the period when studious efforts were made to distort and pervert all Messianic prophecies, another interpretation existed, which referred the whole to Joshua and Zerubbabel. The way in which this interpretation was brought into the text we learn from Jerome. By this sprout was understood Zerubbabel; in v. 13, at וְהָיָה, a change of the subject was assumed, in order to get rid of the union, which could not be shown in his case, of the regal and high-priestly dignity; He, Zerubbabel, will sit and reign on his throne, and there will also be a priest Joshua on his throne; "*Sed et pontifex Jesus, fil. Josedech, sedebit in sacerdotali throno et junctis animis atque consiliis dei populum gubernabunt. Et erit pax inter duos illos, h. e. inter eum, qui de tribu regia est, et eum, qui de Levitica stirpe descendit, ut sacerdotium pariter et regnum dei populum regant.*" The innocent occasion of this interpretation, which was welcome to most of the later Jewish interpreters on account of doctrinal prejudice, was given by the words, "He will build the temple of the Lord." As they did not perceive, that the prophet, who regarded the building of the outward temple, carried on in the present, as a type of one which was to be future and more glorious, in like manner as its conductors, Joshua and Zerubbabel, were regarded as a type of the future spiritual master-builder, here looked beyond the shadow to the substance, they believed, that these words excluded the reference to the Messiah, and sufficiently estab-

lished the reference to Zerubbabel, who, in the preceding context, chap. 4 : 9, is mentioned as builder of the temple.

The pernicious influence of this misunderstanding, which has the less ground in reality in the case of Zechariah, (the more usual it is for him to rise from the shadow to the substance,) may also be perceived in some interpreters of the Christian church. Thus, Theod.: *Ταῦτα δὲ ἅπαντα περὶ τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ προαγορεύει, οὐχ ὡς μηδέπω τεχθέντος, ἀλλ' ὡς μηδέπω τὴν ἡγεμονίαν παρειληφότος.* So also Eusebius, *Demonstr.* 4, 17. In their case this error was the more pardonable, since the *παρερμηνεία* of v. 13, connected with this interpretation was favored by the Alexandrine version, to the use of which they were confined. The Seventy, participating perhaps themselves in this error, translate, "and he is a priest on his throne," by *καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ*, and make, therefore, out of the king, who is himself at the same time a high priest, a king and a high priest standing by his side. It would be expected, that Grotius would eagerly seize the plausible ground for rejecting the Messianic interpretation, which was afforded him by such predecessors. According to him, the sense of the prophecy may be paraphrased as follows: *Sicut domus Davidis renata est in Serubabele, ita per eum renascetur templum*, (ומתחתיו יצמח he explains by "the temple will spring up under him, under his feet"), "*cujus primum positurus est lapidem. Ipse quoque portabit coronam principis et in solio sedens simul cum senatoribus jura dicet. Etiam sacerdos in eodem illo senatu solium habebit, et optime inter illos duos conveniet.*" — In the steps of Grotius followed Le Clerc, who, in contradiction to his own interpretation on Jer. 23 : 5, where he refers this passage, as well as chap. 3, to the Messiah, in the translation of Zechariah (he has not left a commentary) makes Joshua and Zerubbabel the object of the prophecy; and with them agrees the superficial Calmet, who, strange enough, not merely by the Catholics, but also in England by the Protestants, is regarded as a sort of exegetical authority. In recent times, Eichhorn (Hebr. Proph. 3, p. 353 sqq.) sought to reëstablish this interpretation without any regard to the fundamental refutations of it, e. g. by Mark, and by Reuss (l. c. p. 68 sqq.) This, however, is not surprising, when we consider the dread of labor, and neglect of all former learned apparatus, manifest throughout the whole work. In the highest degree *naïve* is the way, in which he seeks to free himself from the difficulty attending this interpretation, that in the symbolic action the crown is placed upon only one, Joshua, while

yet the prophecy explanatory of it must refer to two subjects, Joshua and Zerubbabel. He asserts, that in v. 11, after the words, "and place it upon Joshua the son of Josedech, the high priest," the words, "and Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, the prince," have fallen out, and restores them in his translation. Such an instance of caprice must surely, as an involuntary confession on the part of the author of the erroneousness of his interpretation, as a manifestation of an evil exegetical conscience, deter every one from following him, who is not determined, like Theiner, who here also subscribes to Eichhorn, to reject at any price whatever stands in the way of his preconceived opinions.

We here exhibit only a few of the numerous reasons, which refute this monstrous interpretation, and establish the reference to the Messiah. 1. The parallel passages decide for the Messiah; in the first place, chap. 3: 8, where, as here, He bears the name of sprout, and where Joshua is expressly designated as His type; then the prophecies already cited of Jeremiah respecting the צֶמַח, which the prophet plainly had before his eyes; lastly, Ps. 110, the prediction of which, that the dignity of king and that of high priest should be united in the Messiah, is here only further carried forward, so that Grotius, though wholly inconsistent, confesses that every other reference of this Psalm, except that to the Messiah, is untenable. 2. If the prophecy refers to Joshua and Zerubbabel, it cannot be perceived why the crown, the badge of dominion, is placed upon Joshua alone, and not upon Zerubbabel also, even granting, what is entirely without proof, that it might be at the same time a sign of the high-priestly dignity. Joshua could not be a type of Zerubbabel; for what ground could the prophet have had to typify one contemporary by another? 3. The translation of וְהָיָה כֹהֵן עַל־כִּסְאוֹ in v. 13, by "and there will *also* be a priest on his seat," is in itself in the highest degree forced, besides being utterly refuted by the discord, which would then arise between the verbal and symbolical prophecy. 4. Zerubbabel cannot be understood by the sprout; for he is predicted as future, while Zerubbabel had now been active eighteen years in the new colony, and the building of the temple, here announced as future, had been already long ago commenced. Nor can it be said in reply, with Theodoret, that the discourse here relates to his promotion to a new dignity. Zerubbabel remained, after this prophecy, what he was before. He never attained to the regal dignity here predicted. 5. According to this interpretation,

nothing can be conceived more unmeaning than this prophecy, which is so solemn and promises such great things. Joshua and Zerubbabel, — this were all, — shall continue to be what they are! 6. The prophecy of the reception of the heathen into the Theocracy, v. 15, a feature from the Messianic time, stands then entirely isolated, and we know not how it came here. In like manner no reason can then be assigned, why the gold and silver for the crown should be taken "from the captivity," though this feature in a symbolical action, where nothing else is unmeaning, cannot be without design. That v. 14 treats of something entirely different from a common memorial of the liberality of the generous donors, (Grotius: "*Suspendentur in templo, annotato nomine eorum, qui ea rite dedicarunt,*") is self-evident.

Chap. 7 and 8.

These two chapters, which contain a distinct discourse, are simple and easy compared with the foregoing and the following, and we need not dwell upon them long, since they contain little that immediately serves our purpose. The prophecy is separated from the foregoing by a period of about two years; it falls in the ninth month of the fourth year of Darius. This date, subjoined by the prophet, is important, because it throws light on the event, which occasioned the prophecy. This was the following. The congregation (the house of God, v. 2) caused inquiry to be made by certain deputies, sent to the temple, whether they should continue to observe the fasts hitherto kept on the day of the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, and which contained a penitential confession of guilt and a prayer for forgiveness and restoration of the former prosperity. In this *question* there is at the same time included a *supplication*, that God would very soon change the days of mourning into days of rejoicing. Therefore, it is said, v. 2, the deputies have come to supplicate the Lord. Both inquiry and supplication presuppose, that in the relations of the present there was ground to hope for a favorable future. But this can be shown to be the case in precisely the fourth year of Darius. The building of the temple had hitherto been unremittingly and successfully prosecuted. The new machinations of

the Samaritans in the Persian court, with a design to arrest its progress had been already completely defeated, (comp. Prideaux.) The pusillanimity of the returned exiles was thus put to shame, and they gave themselves up henceforth to the most joyful hopes in reference to the future.

The question was directed to the priests and prophets collected in the temple, in the hope that God would reveal his will by one of them. This was done through Zechariah. His answer consists of two parts. In the first, chap. 7 : 5 – 14, he employs himself in rebuking the base motive from which the question, at least with a part of the inquirers, originated. That dead, hypocritical self-righteousness already existed in the germ, which, continually gaining ground, became at a later period as destructive to the new colony, as outward idolatry, resting on the same principle, had been in former times. This self-righteous spirit exerted the most prejudicial influence on the view entertained of fasts. They attributed an intrinsic value, as a mere *opus operatum*, to that which had no meaning, except as an outward manifestation of a penitent heart. They believed merit to be thereby attained, and wondered and murmured, that God so long delayed to acknowledge and reward it. The prophet shows how absurd was this notion ; and that the Lord required something entirely different, the fulfilment of the moral precepts of his law, without which all outward worship was only hypocrisy ; he reminds them, that the disregard of this requisition, loudly and repeatedly expressed by the former prophets, brought upon the people the previous inexpressible calamity, from which they had not yet recovered, and that a like cause would be attended with the like effect in future. — In the second part of the discourse, chap. 8, the prophet then proceeds to give a direct answer to the question, which could not now serve to confirm the hypocrites in their carnal security, but might well console and strengthen the weak in faith in his own and subsequent times, until the appearing of Christ. For the covenant people, — this is the sum, — so great prosperity is destined, that the day of the destruction of the temple, as well as the remaining fast-days, at that time observed in remembrance of particular melancholy events of the past; the day of the capture of Jerusalem in the fourth, the day of the murder of Jedaliah in the seventh, and the day of the beginning of the siege in the tenth month, should be changed into days of rejoicing, because the future blessings would be far greater than those which had been lost. The

prophet here also embraces the whole of the prosperity destined for the covenant people, and his prediction was first completely fulfilled in Christ. We must refer exclusively to the glorification, conferred through him upon the kingdom of God, the conclusion, v. 20 – 23; where, as an enlargement upon Micah 4 : 2, Is. 4 : 3, Jer. 31 : 6, the zeal of the heathen nations for admittance into the Theocracy is described.

Chap. 9 : 1 – 10.

A victorious hostile army inundates the kingdom of Persia, and precipitates it from the summit of its power. The prophet represents particularly its march through those provinces of the kingdom of Persia, which lay nearest to Judea, in order by the contrast with their mournful fate to place the better lot of the covenant people in a stronger light. While Damascus and Hamath are overtaken by the divine judgment and captured by the conqueror, while Tyre, unprotected by all its riches, its bulwarks and its position in the sea, is plundered and burnt, while the adjoining Philistia loses its ancient splendor, and its chief cities, Askelon, Gaza, Ekron, and Ashdod, sink into the deepest abasement, Jerusalem under the divine protection remains unhurt, v. 1 – 8. There can be no doubt, that we have before us a description of the march of Alexander, as plain as the difference between prophecy and history, which must always be observed, would allow. In the principal points the exact fulfilment of the prediction can be shown by express historical testimony. The capture of Damascus is described by Arrian 2, 15, Curt. 3, 25, Plut. Alex. cap. 24. The fate of Tyre and Gaza is so well known, that it need not more particularly be pointed out. According to Arrian 2, 27, Alexander changed the latter, once a flourishing city, into a mere castle, after he had repeopled it with a colony from the neighbouring tribes, exactly as it had been predicted, v. 6, concerning Ashdod. That the capture of Hamath is not expressly related is not surprising, since the historians follow Alexander himself, who kept along the seacoast, while the land of Hamath must have been in the way of Parmenio on his march to Damascus. Just as little is an express mention of the fate of the remaining cities of Philistia besides Gaza to be expected, since the

historians of Alexander in describing his march through Syria and Palestine are so remarkably brief, (comp. J. D. Michaelis, p. 190,) and since in general they select from the great mass of events only the most important, particularly those which throw light upon the character of Alexander, who is everywhere, especially with Arrian, the chief object of attention. It has been fully shown in the *Beiträgen*, 1, p. 277, how history fully confirms, what is here predicted of the preservation of the covenant people during that expedition, so destructive to the neighbouring lands.

In v. 9 and 10, the prophet contrasts the inferior blessing of God with the higher, the sending of the Messiah, at which he had already, v. 7, cast a passing look. (See on the relation of the two predictions the Introduction to chap. 9 : 11, &c.)

Before proceeding to the interpretation, we offer a dissertation respecting the land of Hadrach, which is mentioned, v. 1, as the chief object of the prophecy.

Concerning the Land of Hadrach.

The opinion, which had been advanced by several Jewish interpreters on the authority of R. Jose, and by several older Christian interpreters, particularly since the example of Bochart, that the land of Hadrach, אֶרֶץ חַדְרָךְ, Zech. 9 : 1, is a region in the neighbourhood of Damascus, has been rendered universally prevalent in recent times by the arguments of Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 676, which have only been repeated by Gesenius, Jahn, Köster, Rosenmüller, and Winer. It is the more necessary, so to proceed in its refutation, that the invalidity of each one of its apparent supports may be clearly seen. We affirm, that all historical testimonies, which have been brought for the existence of a province of Hadrach, rest on its being confounded with the Arabic city Draa, or Adraa, written أُذْرُعَات the ancient Edrei, אֶדְרֶעִי, which Deut. 1 : 5, is mentioned as the second residence of Og, King of Basan. According to Abulfeda, *Tabula Syriæ*, p. 97, it was distant about six and a half German miles from Damascus; it was still of importance in the middle ages, the residence of the Suffragan of Bozrah, is often mentioned in the history of the crusades, and, according to the account of Seetzen, is now lying in ruins and uninhabited, (comp. Ritter,

Erdk. II. p. 360–362) In several older writers the confusion of the two names, which, according to the Hebrew and Arabic mode of writing have scarcely any relation, very plainly appears. Thus, e. g. in Adrichomius, *Theatr. Terræ S.*, p. 75. "*Adrach, sive Hadrach, alias Adra, Adraon et Adratum, Cælesyriæ oppidum est, a Bostra viginti quinque millibus, distans a quo etiam adjacens regio terra Hadrach nuncupatur. De qua Zacharias prophetavit. Post Christi tempora urbs hæc, episcopali sede cohonestata, archiepiscopo Bostrensi parebat. Atque quo tempore Occidentales Christiani rerum in Palæstina potiebantur, etiam vulgo civitas Bernardi de Scampis dicta fuit.*" In like manner, in Calmet, on Zech. l. c. "*Nous connoissons une ville d'Atra dans l'Arabie deserte, célèbre autrefois, et qui soutint des siéges contre l'armée de Trajan commandée par lui même (Xiphilin. ex Dione et Dion.) et contre celle de l'empereur Sévère (Herodian. l. 3, 9, Zonaras p. 216.) Cf. Cellarius l. 3, cap. 15.*" In respect to others, on the contrary, the permutation, because not expressly mentioned, needs to be more particularly pointed out. We commence with that, which, after Michaelis triumphing in his discovery, is cited by all as the most conclusive. We cannot refrain from quoting his language, which is somewhat diffuse: "*Sed his addo, quæ anno* 1768 *a nobili Arabe Transjordanense, Josepho Abbassi didici. ..... Interrogabam inter alia, ... nossetne urbem aliquam* حدرخ, *sic enim literis Arabicis scribebam. ..... Respondebat, esse ejus nominis urbem, deque ea se audivisse, sed nunquam ibi fuisse. Parvum nunc esse, sed majorem olim fuisse ipsa Damasco referri. ..... Addebat, ferri metropolin fuisse magnæ regionis, quæ terra Hadrach vocetur. Nobiles ex hac terra Hadrach familias ortas dici, multaque de ejus regibus et principibus narrare Arabes, referri etiam, quod olim gigantes habuerit. Ferri etiam fabulam, Muhammedem ex hac regione ortum. ..... Jam, ... instabam, ubinam sita esset. Hoc negabat se accuratius referre posse, id modo meminisse audire, a Damasco versus desertum sitam esse, forte decimo a Damasco milliari. Oblitus sum interrogare, quæ milliaria intelligeret, sed puto, milliaria majora Arabum,* 19, *v.* 20, *unius gradus.*" The easiest way of setting aside this testimony would be an appeal to the fact, established beyond a doubt by Steph. Schulz in the *Leitungen des Höchsten*, that the person on whose authority Michaelis relies was a deceiver. But the subject would not then be entirely disposed of, since this deceiver actually was from the land from which he pretended to have

come, and therefore might have imparted correct geographical and historical information concerning it Besides, on a nearer examination his statement appears to be true, with the exception of his confounding *Hadrach* and *Adraa*, which can the more easily be explained, since he had never himself been in the place, and had received his accounts only from hearsay testimony. The reality of this permutation, however, appears from the following reasons. 1. Not only does the direction from Damascus towards the wilderness, consequently towards Arabia, in which Hadrach was supposed to lie, entirely coincide, but also the distance, since the ten Arabic miles make about 7 or 8 German. 2. Abbassi says, there are many traditions respecting the ancient kings of this region, whose former inhabitants are supposed to have been giants. Who is not here at once reminded of the account of the Pentateuch respecting the gigantic King Og, of Basan, whose iron bedstead was nine cubits long and four broad, and who reigned over the Anakims, a very strong and tall people, (comp. Numb. 22 : 33, Deut. 2 : 10, 11, 3 : 11.) These accounts probably passed from the Christians, who, in the middle ages were still numerous in Adraa, to the Arabians, who, according to their custom, embellished them still more, for which they had much inducement in the nature of the country. (According to Leetzen, it is full of caverns.) — What is said of the former greatness, and the present ruin of the city, perfectly agrees with Adraa. — If we have now disposed of this chief testimony, the only two which remain need not occasion any embarrassment. The one is that of Theodoret: Ἁδρὰχ πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Ἀραβίας. The permutation was here the more easy, as Theodoret expresses the Hebr. ה by *a*, and that it really existed is placed beyond a doubt, by the designation of Adrach, as a city in Arabia. The second testimony is that of R. Jose in Jarchi, on the passage: "*Sed dicebat illi Rabbi Jose, filius Damascenæ mulieris, in disputatione: Cœlum et terram super me invoco: natus sum Damasci, estque locus aliquis, cujus nomen est Hadrach.*" As we have already had so many examples of a permutation of Adraa and Hadrach, we can, without calling in question his honesty, confidently reject the testimony of R. Jose, who hardly investigated with accuracy, whether the Hebrew and the Arabic letters exactly correspond, and perhaps had never seen the name of the place written.

The proof already adduced, that hitherto no evidence has been furnished of the existence of a city and province of Hadrach, con-

ducts us beyond its immediate object. It shows, at the same time, that Hadrach cannot be a proper name. If, indeed, the word occurred in a historical book, as the Pentateuch, or one of the other older books, as a conjectural appellation of a comparatively unimportant place, in a region little known in ancient or modern times, perhaps in the interior of Africa, then nothing could be more illogical than this conclusion. But here is directly the opposite of all this; it occurs in a prophetical book, where symbolical appellations are to be expected in accordance with the whole character of prophetic representation; in one of the latest books of Scripture, whereby the evasion is excluded, that all remembrance of the place except the name, had perished, it designates not indeed a single city, but a whole region, or a whole land, whose nearness to Damascus shows, that we must look for it in a cultivated portion of the earth, sufficiently known in ancient and modern times. How then can it be conceived, that such a land, if it actually existed under the geographical name of Hadrach, should escape all ancient and modern researches? That the Seventy knew nothing of any such country, is evident from their changing the name to Σεδράχ, which is by no means, as Michaelis l. c. p. 679, asserts, a mistake, but the original reading contained in all manuscripts, which Jerome corrected, not by Greek manuscripts, but by the Hebrew text. That, in general, the older Jews were not in possession of any historical information respecting a land of Hadrach, is evident from the fact, that it was universally understood by them as a symbolic designation. The Chaldee translates בַּאֲרַעָא דָרוֹמָה, *in terra australi*, probably with reference to the passages, Job 9: 9, 37: 9, where חַדְרֵי תֵימָן, "the chambers of the south," occurs of the extreme and inaccessible regions of the south, not considering that the idea of the south here lies only in the word תֵּימָן. Jarchi says, expressly, that the figurative understanding of the word prevailed among the Jews, until Rabbi Jose established his better view, as he supposed. Jerome, who here also drew from a Jewish source, as is shown by the agreement of his explanation with that of the Jews, makes no mention whatever of the existence of a literal interpretation. In this condition of things, therefore, we have the less reluctance to regard Hadrach as a figurative designation, since the use of such designations by the prophets is so very frequent. It is known that in Isaiah, Jerusalem is designated by the symbolical names *Ariel*, "lion of God," and *valley of vision*, as a residence of the prophets; Babylon, by *the*

Desert of the Sea, Idumea by *Dumah;* in Ezekiel, Jerusalem by *Oholibah;* in Jeremiah, Babylon by *Sesach*. Even had there been no external occasion why Zechariah should have chosen this figurative epithet, still this would have been no decisive objection; for such was the fact with respect to most of the appellations we have cited. If now we have shown that this name is symbolical, it becomes necessary to point out its meaning. Here, however, we cannot long remain in doubt. The correct interpretation has not now to be sought. In respect to the meaning, not the application of the word, it is the oldest interpretation extant, and is perhaps confirmed by the authority of tradition, although on account of its intrinsic advantages, it stands in no need of any such support. Jarchi and Kimchi say: "*Allegorice interpretabatur R. Juda filius Elai*, (a pupil of Akibah in the time of Adrian, comp. Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. I, p. 411), *de Messia, qui sit acutus* (חד) *gentibus, et mollis* (רך) *Israeli.*" Jerome: "*Assumtio verbi domini, acuti in peccatores, mollis in justos: Adrach quippe hoc resonat, ex duobus integris nomen compositum: Ad acutum, Rach molle tenerumque significans.*" We readily relinquish to both their Messianic interpretation, and receive from them only their explanation of the words. In accordance with this, the land Hadrach, is the land *strong-weak*, a land, which, now strong and powerful, when the threatened divine judgment takes place, shall be weakened and brought down.

It is easy to show that this interpretation is entirely sustained by philology, and, in general, that it is the only one which is admissible. That the practice of composition was in use not only in actual *proper names*, but also in symbolic appellations, is evident from such examples as Ariel, Jehoshaphat, Abiad, &c. The word, חַד, properly signifies indeed *sharp*, spoken of the sword, Ps. 57 : 5, Is. 49 : 2. Then, however, in a metaphorical sense, *acris*, "active, powerful." In the Arabic the verb حَدَّ has the sense, *vehemens fuit, durus in ira, pugna*, and with similar import occurs also the Hebr. חָזַר, in Hab. 1 : 8, where it is said of the horses of the Chaldeans חַדּוּ מִנְּמֵרֵי עֶרֶב, on which Bochart, *Opp.* II. *c.* 826, very justly remarks: "*Malim tamen* (חַדּוּ) *referre ad animum; et tam lupos, quam equos hic ὀξεῖς et acres dici, quia quidquid agendum sibi proponunt, acriter exequuntur et summa contentione.*" In reference to the word רָךְ no farther explanation is necessary, since all agree,

(comp. e. g. Winer s. v.), that it signifies *mollis, tener*, and secondarily, *debilis, infirmus*.

According to this interpretation, therefore, the symbolical appellation of the land comprehends at the same time the prediction of its impending fate, the substance of what the prophet had before foretold concerning it. This must recommend the interpretation the more in the case of a prophet, who relied so much on his predecessors, since we can produce from them several entirely analogous examples The first is that of Isaiah 21 : 1, where, in a prophecy predicting the destruction of Babylon, it is called מִדְבַּר יָם, the desert of the sea. Did we follow the interpretation of Gesenius, this passage would not indeed be to the purpose ; it would contain merely a geographical designation of Babylon. He translates, "the plain on the sea," i. e. on the Euphrates, but this is inadmissible, even on philological grounds. It is impossible that מִדְבָּר, according to etymology and usage, can signify a highly cultivated plain, which the country round Babylon at that time was. It everywhere means a region which is suited only for pasturage, and secondarily a wilderness. There can be no doubt, that Babylon on account of its impending total destruction is called a desert, and a desert of the sea, because the waters of the Euphrates, no longer restrained by the broken dykes, overflow the level country, and convert it into a marsh, which it formerly was, according to ancient accounts. The correctness of the latter supposition is evident from the parallel passage, chap. 14 : 23, where it is said of Babylon : "I will make her pools of water," אֲגַמִּים. A complete commentary on both words is furnished by Jer. chap. 51 : 42, 43. — Another analogy is supplied by the superscription : "Burden upon Dumah," in the prophecy of Isaiah against Edom, chap. 21 : 11, דּוּמָה, *silence*. Death-stillness shall reign in the desolate land. This figurative designation is the more suitable, since in the prophecy itself the calamity is represented under the image of a dreary and solitary night. — Most analogous, however, is the designation of Babylon by *Sesach* in Jeremiah, the formation and import of which must here be more thoroughly investigated. According to the unanimous assertion of the Jewish interpreters, שֵׁשַׁךְ is the same as Babel, according to the Alphabet Atbasch. Many Christian interpreters have rejected this assertion as a Jewish fancy, others have regarded it as at least extremely doubtful, while others still, particularly Jerome, have adopted it with great confidence. There can, however, be no doubt of

its correctness. The opposition to it must have arisen partly from the circumstance, that, while the import of the word Sesach did not readily occur, such a transposition was regarded as a useless expedient, foreign from the age of Jeremiah, and unworthy of a prophet, and partly from the idea that the Alphabet Atbasch was something extremely complicated and artificial. The former ground of hesitation we shall hereafter remove; as to the latter, nothing is more simple, than the operation whereby for the first letter of the Alphabet at the beginning א, the first at the end ת, for the second ב, the second from the end ש, &c., is placed, (comp. Buxtorf *lex. Chald. s. v* אתבש and *De Abbreviaturis Hebraic.* p. 41.) The proofs that Jeremiah actually used this Alphabet are the following. 1. It cannot possibly be accidental, that the name שֵׁשַׁךְ, according to the Alpha. אתבש precisely corresponds to that which is placed in its stead. Certainly such a coincidence would be entirely without example. 2. There is still another undoubted instance where Jeremiah has availed himself of this Alphabet, although less regarded by recent interpreters than the foregoing, while Castalio and Grotius do not hesitate to adopt the Jewish interpretation. It is found in the passage, Jer. 51 : 1. The prophet there says : "Thus saith the Lord : Behold I raise up a destroying wind, עַל־בָּבֶל וְאֶל־יֹשְׁבֵי לֵב קָמָי, against Babel and the inhabitants of the heart of my adversary." The great singularity of the expression here deserves attention ; "the heart of my adversary." This cannot be removed by any explanation, but disappears when we consider the remark of Jarchi and Abenezra, that both words together, when read according to the Alphabet Atbash, make כַּשְׂדִּים. The correctness of the interpretation is here the less doubtful, since the number of the letters is so great, and an accidental coincidence is still more inconceivable than in the case of Babel. In addition to this, Jeremiah elsewhere also not only places in general, as chap. 50 : 10, כַּשְׂדִּים, *Chaldeans*, for the land of the Chaldeans, but, precisely as in the present instance, combines Babel and Joschbe Kasdim. Thus, chap. 51 : 35, חֲמָסִי וּשְׁאֵרִי עַל־בָּבֶל — וְדָמִי אֶל — יֹשְׁבֵי כַשְׂדִּים. The fitness of the play upon words, — the Chaldeans, as the most dreaded enemies of the people of God in the time of the prophet, called "the heart of his adversary," — is obvious. It appears that the key to the interpretation of this passage was not discovered again by the later Jews, but has been handed down by tradition. The translation of the Seventy : καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Χαλδαίους, shows, that they were *already* or

rather *still* in possession of it; that this was the case with the Chaldee interpreters is evident from their translation אַרְעָא דְכִשְׁרָא. Had Symmachus sought for nothing in the expression beyond what lies on the face of it, he would not have retained the Hebrew expression (*Δεβκαμμα*) in his version.

We proceed now to make out the import of the name *Sesach*. For, if this cannot be done, the charge of trifling would be in a measure just. That it has a meaning, however, is evident even from the analogy of לֵב קָמַי. What this is cannot long remain in doubt. If we follow the formation of בָּבֶל itself, which in Genesis is derived from בָּלַל, *to confound*, and explained by *confusion*, a derivation and explanation, which Jeremiah certainly had in view, and which accounts for the otherwise irregular formation, then must שֵׁשַׁךְ be derived from the verb שָׁכַךְ. This derivation is also confirmed by the occurrence of the *infin.* of this verb in Jeremiah 5 : 26, in the elsewhere unusual form שָׁךְ, (comp. Gesen. Lehrg. p. 365.) To this must be added the great appropriateness of the meaning. The verb שָׁכַךְ occurs, Genesis 8 : 1, in the sense *desedit*, of the subsiding waters of the flood; Jer. l. c., of the crouching of the bird-catchers. *Sesach*, accordingly, would mean *sinking down*, and we have a commentary on this appellation in Jer. 61 : 64 : "Therefore shall Babel be sunk down and not raise itself up for the evil which I bring upon it." — That Sesach gives a complete analogy for Hadrach must now be obvious.

It still remains for us to inquire, what kingdom Zechariah intended by this symbolic appellation. Every thing here is in favor of Persia. 1. The appellation itself shows that the kingdom must be one, which was at that time at the summit of its elevation and power. But of those connected with the covenant people, this was the case only with the Persian. To this all the rest were subject; with none of them did the predicate חָד agree. 2. This explanation is the most in accordance with the whole contents of v. 1 – 8. If in them the expedition of Alexander is described, nothing is more suitable than that the prophet should not proceed to describe the fates of the particular regions dependent on this kingdom, until he had mentioned, in the first place, the kingdom itself, the chief object of the expedition. 3. It is easily explained on this supposition, why Zechariah employs a symbolical name in this instance only. He lived under the dominion of the Persians; and to name them would have been the more dangerous, since the enemies of the Jews did

all in their power to calumniate them as seditious; comp. Ezra 4: 12, 13. The naming of the other regions, which were subject to the Persians, could not so easily furnish a ground of complaint, since it would be perceived, that, in case of a rebellion, the Persians themselves would be the conquerors.

V. 1. "*The word of the Lord burdens the land of Hadrach; Damascus is its resting-place; for the eye of the Lord looks upon men and upon all the tribes of Israel.*" The noun מַשָּׂא, in the superscriptions of the prophecies, has been from ancient times interpreted in two different ways. According to the one interpretation it means *burden*. Thus Jonathan, Aquila, the Syriac, and especially Jerome, who on Nah. 1: 1, says, "*Massa autem nunquam præfertur in titulo, nisi cum grave et ponderis laborisque plenum est, quod videtur;*" comp. Hab. 1: 1, Is. 13: 1. This interpretation was for a long period, if not the sole, yet the received one. According to other interpreters it means *declaration, prophecy*. Thus the Seventy, who sometimes render the word by ὅραμα, ὅρασις, ῥῆμα, very frequently by λῆμμα, *acceptio*. This interpretation, from being adopted by Cocceius (*Lex. s. v.*,) Vitringa (on Is. 13: 1), Aurivillius (*Dissert. p.* 560), and Michaelis (*Supplem. p.* 1685), who, out of forbearance will not mention the names of those who adhere to the former, became predominant. It has since become generally prevalent; Gesenius (Lex. and on Isaiah 13: 1), Rosenmüller, Jahn (*Vatic. Mess.* 1, *p.* 174), Köster, Winer, consider it as hardly needing any further proof. As we nevertheless consider it entirely erroneous, a thorough refutation is the more necessary, as not merely the correct interpretation of this passage, but also that of chap. 12: 1, depends on the right explanation of the word. 1. It would be an extremely singular occurrence, if מַשָּׂא, although equally suited for a superscription of a consoling, as of a threatening prophecy, should still be confined exclusively to those of the latter class. Such, however, is the fact, and it occurs so frequently as to exclude every thought of its being accidental. That in Isaiah מַשָּׂא is prefixed only to prophecies which threaten adversity, is confessed by all, (comp. 13: 1, 14: 25, 15: 1, 17: 1, 19: 1, 21: 1, 11, 13, 22: 1, 23: 1.) If this appearance were found only in Isaiah, the conjecture

of Gesenius, (l. c. p. 21), otherwise without support, would have some plausibility, that the prophecies against foreign nations originally formed a particular collection, the *Redactor* of which was especially fond of the expression מַשָּׂא, and employed it throughout in the superscriptions. But, if we perceive the same phenomena everywhere repeated, and in Nahum, Habbakuk, Zechariah, and Malachi, מַשָּׂא is found only in threatening prophecies, it is obvious that Isaiah and the other prophets must have been influenced by a common reason; and this can be no other, than that the import of the word renders it a suitable superscription only for prophecies of a threatening character. Vitringa, Michaelis, and others, in proof that מַשָּׂא may stand also in connexion with consoling prophecies, appeal to the single passage, Zech. 12 : 1; but only according to an erroneous interpretation, as we shall hereafter see. Gesenius still adds, in an unaccountable manner, Mal. 1 : 1. That the word is here connected with a prophecy of a threatening character is so manifest as to need no farther proof. 2. It cannot be proved, in general, that מַשָּׂא ever occurs as a noun derived from the verb נָשָׂא, in the sense *to pronounce*, but always from נָשָׂא in the sense *tollere*. The most plausible passages are Prov. 30 : 1, 31 : 1. But a nearer examination shows, that here also the meaning, *declaration*, or *word of God*, is entirely unsuitable, particularly in the former passage, where it would make an empty tautology. The true meaning here also is *burden*, i. q. a weighty sentence, *verborum pondera*. 1 Chron. 15 : 27, שַׂר הַמַּשָּׂא, according to Gesenius and Winer, imports *master of the song*. But that מַשָּׂא here stands rather for the bearing of the holy things cannot be questioned, if any regard is paid to the parallel passages, 2 Chron. 35 : 3, Num. 4 : 19, 24, 27, 31, 32, 47, 49. But even in the cognate מַשָּׂאת, the meanings (*to bear*, *burden*) are derived only from נָשָׂא, in the sense *tollere*, and not in the sense *to pronounce*. Michaelis and Winer appeal, indeed, for proof of the contrary, to Lam. 2 : 14, where the predictions of the false prophets are called מַשְׂאוֹת שָׁוְא, which is interpreted "vain predictions." But it is there rather to be translated; "they see for thee vain burdens and exiles." Even the following מַדָּחִים, *exiles*, *dispersions*, shows that מַשְׂאוֹת also must refer to the enemy. The false prophets endeavour to make themselves beloved by the people, by predicting a great calamity, which should come upon their powerful oppressors. To give to מַדָּחִים another meaning is inadmissible, because the verb נָדַח, in Jeremiah, in whom it frequently occurs, always sig-

nifies *to expel, to disperse.* 3. The very passage, Jer. 23 : 33, &c., relied upon for proof, that מַשָּׂא has the meaning of prophecy, evinces the contrary. According to the usual acceptation, Jeremiah is there angry with the scoffers, because they presuppose, taking the word מַשָּׂא, signifying *prophecy*, in the sense *burden*, that he would utter only prophecies announcing calamity. But this could hardly have so offended Jeremiah, and appeared to him as so ungodly, since his prophecies, before the destruction of Jerusalem, are in fact, generally of a melancholy character, and as he had predicted, to these scoffers in particular, nothing but adversity. Their wickedness manifested itself rather in their taking the *burden* in another sense, than that in which it had been used by the prophet, which was that of a prophecy, which predicted heavy judgments of the Lord. They ask Jeremiah what is the burden of the Lord, what he has received for a *burdensome* prophecy. But this ungodly play upon words, which gives a deep insight into the unbelieving heart of the scoffers, could only exist when מַשָּׂא was used by the prophet in the sense *burden*. 4. Had מַשָּׂא the sense, *declaration, word of God*, and were it therefore synonymous with נְאֻם, it would still be strange that it never, like the latter, occurs with the genitive of the author, that on the contrary, the genitive connected with it, is always *genit. objecti*, e. g. מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל, מַשָּׂא דּוּמָה. In the sense *burden*, מַשָּׂא is also elsewhere connected with the genitive of him who bears it, or upon whom it is laid. 5. The sense *burden*, in this passage, is more agreeable to the parallelism. מַשָּׂא then corresponds to מָנוֹחָה. The *burden* of the word of the Lord strikes or falls on Hadrach; its *rest* is Damascus. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the prophet by these words indicates that a heavy calamity, and one which could not be evaded, because it was threatened by the Lord, and would be inflicted by him, would come upon Hadrach and Damascus. A parallel passage is Is. 9 : 7; "The Lord sends a word to Jacob; it falls upon Israel." Precisely as Damascus is here represented as the rest of the divine word, or decree of punishment, it is said, chap. 6 : 8, of the ministers and symbols of the divine justice, "They make my anger to rest on the north country."

In the second part of the verse, as is shown by כִּי, the ground of the divine judgment upon Hadrach and Damascus, as well as upon the nations afterwards mentioned, is given. The providence of God rules over the whole earth, which lies open to his view. He cannot fail, therefore, to remove the equality which exists between the fate

of the covenant people, and that of the heathen nations apparently favored by him. Very explanatory are the passages, Mal. 2:17, 3:13, &c., where the prophet introduces the people as speaking, and complaining that the Lord had visited them only with adversity, and conferred great prosperity upon the heathen. Malachi had there to deal with the ungodly portion of the people, who, without having fulfilled the duties of the covenant, boldly insisted on the fulfilment of its promises. Hence his answer is severe; he threatens still heavier judgments. Zechariah had in view the true members of the Theocracy. He promises them, that the Lord at a future period, removing the existing inequality, would humble the proud heathen, and in the present instance protect his people during the hostile invasion, and, finally, by the sending of the Messiah, complete their joy. עַיִן, with the following genitive, here signifies the *eye* that belongs to any one, so far as it is directed towards him. That we are not, with several interpreters, to think of the eye directed to the Lord, appears partly from the entire inappropriateness of the sense, according to such an explanation, partly from the parallel passages of Zechariah himself, besides v. 8; "For now I see with mine eyes," chap. 3:9 and 4:10, where the eye of the Lord is a figurative designation of his all-ruling providence, comp. chap. 5:6. אָדָם by the contrast with כֹּל שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, is limited to the rest of mankind, with the exclusion of Israel. An example of a similar limitation is the very early occurrence, since the tribe of Judah soon gained an ascendency, of Judah and Israel as a designation of the whole of the people, i. q. Judah and the rest of Israel. It appears that the prophet borrowed this idiom from Jer. 32:19, which verse, in other respects, gives a complete parallel for the second half of the one before us. "Thine eyes stand open upon all the ways of the children of men, that thou mayst give to every one according to his walk, and according to the fruit of his works. . . . . Thou, who hast done signs and wonders in Egypt, both in Israel and among men."

V. 2. "*Also Hamath will border thereon, Tyre and Sidon, because it is very wise.*" Most interpreters after Symmachus (ἔτι καὶ ἐν Ἡμὰθ τῇ ὁμορούσῃ) supply before חֲמָת the relative, "also Hamath, which borders on Damascus," to be supplied out of the foregoing verse; "is the resting-point (מְנוּחָה) of the word of God, — in like manner, Tyre and Sidon." Against this interpretation there can nothing exactly decisive be objected; still to understand תִּגְבָּל as *fut.*

is favored by the analogy of the following *futures;* and it is not to be mistaken, that the interpretation we have given after Aquila (*καὶ γε Ἡμὰθ ὁριοτεθήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ Τύρος καὶ Σιδών*), only that he does not make Damascus, but Tyre and Sidon to border thereon, and which is defended particularly by Calvin (*erit in finibus Damasci, h. e. non immunis erit ab ea pœna, quam deus infliget vicino regno Syriæ*), and by Mark, is more forcible; since the bare mention of the bordering of Hamath, whereby we are to understand, not the city, but the province of which it was the capital, on Damascus, expresses nothing further, than what was already known to all the readers of the prophet, and is therefore very insipid. As Hamath is nearly connected with Damascus by locality, so shall it be also by a common calamity. — גַּם is taken by several interpreters, and, lastly, by Rosenmüller, in the sense *quamvis*, — all the cunning of Tyre and Sidon will not avail to avert the ruin, which God sends upon them. Others, as Jahn, regard it as the relative. Both meanings, however, notwithstanding the numerous examples brought by Noldius and Gesenius, rest only on a wrong interpretation of the cited passages, and belong to a period of Hebrew philology, which is now at least passing away, comp. Winer, s. v. גַּם is here also a causative particle. As such, although the other usage were established, must it here be regarded on account of the parallel passages, which in Zechariah have peculiar importance, (comp. Beiträge 1, p. 366.) "Because thou hast made thy heart like the heart of God," (יַעַן תִּתֵּךְ), — says Ezekiel, chap. 28: 6, to the king of Tyre, who appears to him as representative of the whole nation, — "*therefore* I bring upon thee strangers." In him the false wisdom of the Tyrians, who, taking the glory from God, attribute all to themselves, appears throughout as the cause of the judgment threatened against them. The phrase, "because she is very wise," is the same in substance as, "because she thinks herself very wise," "because," as Ezek. 28 : 17 says, "she has corrupted her wisdom, that noble gift of God," (LXX. *διότι ἐφρόνησαν σφόδρα.* Jerome : *assumserunt quippe sibi sapientiam valde,*) according to the uniform usage of Scripture, agreeably to which, since the blessings of this life, on account of the natural depravity of man, are commonly abused, and made the occasion of pride, the words which designate them express at the same time the associated idea of their abuse, in like manner as the words, which express their absence, have at the same time the associated meaning of inward freedom from the temptation inseparable from their possession. Some-

what differently Calvin : " *Utitur honesto nomine per concessionem, quia quicunque animum suum ad fallendum applicant, obtegunt suam vafritiem titulo sapientiæ ; volunt videri cauti, ubi tamen alios scelestè opprimunt suis insidiis et fraudibus.*" According to him, after " because she is wise," we must supply, " in her own eyes," just as in Ezek. 28 : 3 : " Behold thou art wiser than Daniel ; nothing secret is concealed from thee." This usage also is very common in Scripture. More nearly considered, the two interpretations differ only in appearance, because the abuse of spiritual blessings implies at the same time the deprivation of them, and particularly does wisdom, when abused, at once become folly. — Their hostility against the Israelites does not, as in the prophecies of Amos and Zephaniah, unjustly placed entirely upon a par with this, and in part in those also of Ezekiel (comp. chap. 26 : 2,) against Tyre, appear as the cause of the divine judgment, but rather their pride alone, as is the case also in so many other prophecies against foreign nations. The prophecy against Tyre, therefore, is so far from invalidating the genuineness of the second part, that it rather furnishes an argument in its favor. As for the rest, wherein the wisdom of the Tyrians consisted, appears partly from the following verse, where the acquisition of immense riches, and the erection of fortifications, apparently impregnable, are cited as its effects, partly from Ezek. 28 : 4, 5. " By thy wisdom and thy prudence, thou hast acquired for thyself power, and filled thy treasuries with gold and silver. By thy great wisdom in traffic thou hast gained great power, and thy heart has lifted itself up on account of thy power." — The *sing.* חָכְמָה shows, that צֹר וְצִידֹן is to be translated *Tyrus cum Sidone*, comp. Ewald, Gramm. p. 652. " When the predicate follows the subjects it regularly stands in the *plur.* ; . . . . . it can indeed stand also in the *sing.*, but only when one person is to be rendered particularly prominent, and the other is subordinate, as אֲנִי וְנַעֲרֹתַי אָצוּם. *I and my maidens*, i. e. I with my maidens, *will fast.* Esth. 4 : 16, 5 : 4 ; Exod. 21 : 4 ; 2 Sam. 3 : 22." This rule, although in the first instance it relates only to the connexion of the subject and predicate, is still entirely applicable to the present case. The disregard of it has greatly injured the interpretation of this passage. Several interpreters, as Mark, assuming that חָכְמָה could relate only to the immediately preceding Sidon, are embarrassed by the circumstance that Ezekiel, whom Zechariah has in view, speaks only of the wisdom of the Tyrians, and that afterwards, where the particular manifestations

of this wisdom are cited, the Tyrians, and they only, are the subject of discourse. Others have been led by these reasons to refer חָכְמָה to Tyre; thus Rosenmüller; but without any grammatical authority, since, when two *nouns* in the same relation are placed together, the following *verb* in the *sing.* must necessarily refer to the latter. The true interpretation has been given by Ch. B. Michaelis. The reason for connecting Sidon in this way with Tyre must be sought in history. Sidon, although the founder of Tyre, had been obliged at a later period to yield to her the superiority, and had become even in a measure dependent upon her. This is presupposed in the account of the time of Salmanazar, in the fragments from Menander in Joseph. Arch. 9, 14, 2, when it is there said, "Sidon has revolted from Tyre," (*ἀπέστη τε Τυρίων Σιδὼν καὶ Ἄκη καὶ ἡ πάλαι Τύρος καὶ πολλαὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις, αἳ τῷ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἑαυτὰς βασιλεῖ παρέδοσαν.*) Such a dependence is evident also from Is. 23: 2, where it is said Tyre is filled with the merchants of Sidon, if we do not with Gesenius here understand by Sidon, Phœnicia in general, a usage, which at an early period, when Sidon was still the chief city of the Phœnicians, must have naturally arisen, but which can scarcely be proved to have existed in later times. But, in any event, it is evident from Ezek. 27: 8. "They of Sidon and Arvad were thy rowers," on which Theodoret remarks: *Ὅτι οἱ πάλαι σου ἄρχοντες Σιδώνιοι νῦν σὺν τοῖς οἰκοῦσι τὴν Ἄραδον τὸν ναυτικόν σου πληροῦσι στόλον, τὰς σὰς ἐρέττοντες ναῦς· οἱ δὲ παρὰ σοὶ ἐπιστήμονες τὸν κυβερνητικὸν λόγον ἀναπληροῦσι.* Precisely as here in Isaiah and Ezekiel, the prophecy respecting Sidon is only incidentally joined to that of Tyre, and the fate of the former is represented as interwoven with that of the latter. See Is. 23: 4, 12; Ezek. 28: 21, &c.

V. 3. "*And Tyre has built herself strong holds, and heaped up silver as dust, and gold as dirt in the street.*" Cyril well gives the sense: *Οὐκοῦν ἐπειδήπερ φησὶν ὑψηλὴν ἀνασπῶσι τὴν ὀφρὴν Σιδών τε καὶ Τύρος, οἴονται δὲ εἶναι δεινοί τε καὶ ἄθραυστοι, καὶ τεθαρσήκασι μὲν ἐπ' ὀχυρώμασι — ἤγουν καὶ ἑτέροις πράγμασι, δι' ὧν ἂν εὖ οἶκοι καὶ σώζοιτο πόλις, πεφρονήκασι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πλούτῳ μέγα, ταύτητοι, κ. τ. λ.* The sinful confidence in her fortifications and riches is implied in the emphatic לָהּ. Ch. B. Mich.: "*His munimentis sibi, ut valde sapiens, placet egregie, videturque sibi tam egregie prospicere, ut quod metuat in posterum vix habitura sit.*" Similar is Ezek. 28: 2, where the king of Tyre boasts, that he sits in the heart of the sea, and is therefore beyond the reach of every assault. According to

Diodor. Sic. 17, 40, the Tyrians are determined to resist Alexander, *πιστεύοντες τῇ τε ὀχυρότητι τῆς νήσου, καὶ ταῖς ἐν αὐτῇ παρασκευαῖς.* The prophet has no doubt chosen מָצוֹר with reference to its other meaning, *trouble, distress:* ("*Notatur munitionem fore in contritionem.*" Cocc.,) and at the same time with an allusion to the name צֹר, *Tyre.*

V. 4. "*Behold the Lord will give her into the power of her enemies, and strike in the sea her bulwarks; she herself shall be consumed by fire.*" Theodoret: *Ἐπειδὴ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς τῆς θείας κηδεμονίας ἀφώρισαν, πεῖραν τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως λήψονται.* Cyril: *Οὐδὲν οὖν ἄρα τοὺς θεῷ προσκρούοντας ὀνήσει ποτέ.* By the *particle* הִנֵּה, the prophet, who, in inward vision, sees the threatening storm approach, admonishes his hearer and reader to see how the proud hopes of the Tyrians are annihilated. יָרַשׁ in Hiph. *to cause to possess, and that any one becomes possessed, to give a possession.* Calvin has already justly remarked, that this member principally refers to the amassing of gold and silver in the foregoing verse, in like manner as the second to the fortifications. "*Nec dubito, quin alludat propheta ad id, quod paulo ante dixerat, Tyrum cumulasse sibi aurum et argentum. Jam ex opposito pronuntiat, Tyrum ipsam fore expositam dissipationi, quia scilicet quam illa habeat expositam congeriem auri et argenti, dissipabitur a deo.*" Tyre, trusting to her possessions, becomes herself with all her treasures a possession of her enemies. We can neither with the Seventy (*διὰ τοῦτο κύριος κληρονομήσει αὐτήν* — and the Vulgate, *ecce dominus possidebit eam*) translate, "the Lord will take her in possession," on account of the reference to the foregoing verse, although יָרַשׁ, in Hiph. has sometimes the meaning *occupavit;* nor, with Jahn, "he will drive them out," since the following member shows the incorrectness of the assumption, that the city stands for its inhabitants; nor finally, with others, "he will make her poor," since the verb never, not even in 1 Sam. 2: 7, has precisely this meaning. The words, וְהַכָּהּ בַּיָּם חֵילָהּ, are commonly translated, "he throws into the sea her bulwarks." There can be no grammatical objection to this interpretation. For the verbs of motion can be joined with בְּ, the preposition of *rest,* when the thing which is moved goes into the place, and there remains, comp. Ewald, Gramm. p. 605. "To strike into the sea," ב i. q. so to strike that it falls into the sea, and there remains. There is, however, a twofold reason why the word should rather be translated, "he will strike in the sea." 1. The parallel passage 10: 11,

הִכָּה בַיָּם נֵלִים, "he strikes in the sea the waves"; "into the sea" would here give no sense. As there נֵלִים, so here חֵיל must be something, which is already in the sea and is there smitten. 2. This interpretation gives a much more appropriate sense. That the bulwarks of Tyre were thrown into the sea, the capture of the city being presupposed, is self-evident. As the fortifications of Tyre were washed by the sea, they must on its being taken, in part fall into the sea. That the walls should be struck in the sea is an important circumstance. There were three things on which the Tyrians grounded their invincibility, their treasures, their fortifications, their position in the sea. The last, and indeed, precisely the most important, and especially magnified by Ezekiel and also by the Tyrians at the time of the fulfilment, (*κατεγέλων τοῦ βασιλέως, εἰ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἑαυτὸν δοκεῖ περιέσεσθαι.* Diod. Sic. 17, 41,) is here first subjoined by Zechariah. Calvin: "*Hac circumstantia illustrat propheta dei potentiam, ubi volet eam ulcisci; quia scilicet mare non arcebit vel impedict deum ipsum, quum volet illuc penetrare. Putabant enim se tutos esse ab omni hostili incursu Tyrii, quoniam mare ab omni parte erat illis instar triplicis muri et triplicis fossæ.*" As for the rest, we cannot with Köster (*Meletemata*, p. 78), derive from this passage an argument for the genuineness of the second part. For the assumption, that insular Tyre was not founded until after Nebuchadnezzar is erroneous. According to Menander, (in Joseph. Arch. IX. 14, § 2,) insular Tyre was already in the time of Salmanazar much more important than ancient Tyre, situated on the continent. When it is shown that בַּיָּם means, not "into the sea," but "in the sea," it is at the same time proved that חֵיל is not to be translated *opes*, as it has been by several, and lastly by Forberg (*Comment.* p. 21). It must in any event signify the fortifications, since only these were in the sea, and it is unimportant whether the word is חֵיל, *antemurale, munimentum*, or חַיִל, *robur*; for the latter also must be taken as a figurative designation of the works of defence.

V. 5. "*Ascalon beholds it and fears, Gaza beholds it and trembles greatly, also Ekron; for her hope is put to shame; Gaza loses her king, Ascalon will not reign.*" Following the march of the conqueror along the Mediterranean sea, the prophet proceeds from Phœnicia to Philistia. Cyril gives the sense: *ᾤοντο μὲν γὰρ, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοῖς ἰσχύσει πρὸς ἐπικουρίαν ἡ Τυρίων ἰσχύς· ἐπειδὴ δὲ κειμένην τεθέανται, ταύτητοι λοιπὸν ἀπωλισθήκασι τῆς ἐλπίδος.* Zechariah here also appears to have had in view passages of former prophets, especially

Isaiah, chap. 23, where the fear is repeatedly described, which the fall of insular and fortified Tyre would spread among the neighbouring nations and cities. Thus, v. 5 : " When the report reaches Egypt, they will tremble at the report concerning Tyre." V. 4 : " Be ashamed, O Sidon," but especially, v. 11, " He stretches out his hand over the sea, and shakes the kingdoms." And he says : " Thou shalt no longer rejoice, thou disgraced daughter of Sidon," &c. מִבָּט and מִבָּט, " that at which a man looks, an object of hope " ; almost verbally parallel is Isaiah 20 : 5 ; מִכּוּשׁ מִבָּטָם, בּוּשׁ, " They are ashamed of Cush, to which they looked." אֲבַד מֶלֶךְ מֵעַזָּה, not " *the* king," but " *a* king, ceases from Gaza," i. q. " Gaza will hereafter have no king ; " so that the words contain no reference to the ceasing of any particular king from Gaza, as many interpreters have supposed, comp. Amos 1 : 8 ; " I extirpate the inhabitants from Ashdod, those who bear the sceptre from Askelon." Jer. 49 : 38. These parallel passages show that, by the disappearing of the king from the city, its entire ruin and destruction are signified, so that this member fully corresponds to the last : " Askelon will not reign," (erroneously most interpreters, " it will not be inhabited," comp. 12 : 6.) It should not excite surprise here, under the reign of the Persians, to find the mention of a king of Gaza. It is known, that the Philistines from the most ancient times here ruled by kings. The rulers, however, of the great Asiatic empires generally suffered the regal dignity to continue where they found it, in the conquered lands ; they contented themselves with making their kings tributary, and distinguishing themselves from them by the title, " king of kings," comp. Ezek. 26 : 7. Repeated insurrections first induced the Chaldeans to deprive the Jews and Tyrians of their kings ; to the latter the royal dignity was restored during their dominion. In the expedition of Alexander express mention is made of the king of Tyre and the king of Sidon, a sure proof that the Persians also suffered the regal dignity to remain in those regions.

V. 6. " *And a rabble dwells at Ashdod, and I extirpate the pride of the Philistines.*" מַמְזֵר is in any case a designation of a base class of men ; the meaning *stranger*, which several interpreters here give to the word, does not suit the only passage, Deut. 23 : 2, where it occurs besides. Its special import in this passage cannot easily be ascertained, since neither the connexion, nor the etymology, gives any certain indication. This, however, is no serious disadvantage to the interpretation of the passage, since no doubt this particular

kind of base men stands for *rabble* in general, as they are accustomed to pour into colonies. — After Ch. B. Michaelis, Jahn and Rosenmüller erroneously assume, that "I extirpate the pride of the Philistines" is i. q. "I extirpate the proud Philistines." This the prophet cannot wish to say, since in the following verse he predicts the future conversion of the remnant of the Philistines. The pride of the Philistines is rather, that wherein the Philistines placed their pride, their fenced cities, their military power, their wealth, and their riches. These shall be entirely taken from them, and they shall sink into degradation. These words comprehend the whole extent of the prophecy against the Philistines, since they express that of the whole people, which had been said before of the individual cities.

V. 7. "*And I remove his blood out of his mouth, and his abomination from between his teeth; also he shall be left for our God; he shall be as a prince in Judah; Ekron as the Jebusites.*" The ground of the whole verse is a personification of the Philistines; hence are explained, not only the *sing. suff.* הוּא, and the pronoun, but also the much misunderstood words, "He will be as a prince in Judah." By *blood* is not here to be understood, as several interpreters erroneously suppose, that of enemies, particularly the Israelites, shed by the Philistines, but the blood of sacrificial animals, which was drunk by the idolatrous nations at their sacrifices, either pure, or mixed with wine; comp. the proofs in J. D. Michaelis, *Crit. Colleg. über die drei wichtigsten Psalmen von Christo*, p. 107 – 111. The abolition of one particular idolatrous abomination here designates, as a part of the whole, the abolition of idolatry in general. שִׁקּוּצִים, *abomination*, secondarily a usual designation of *idols*. Several interpreters take שִׁקּוּצִים in the sense "flesh of idols." But מִבֵּין שִׁנָּיו furnishes no reason for this. The prophet is led, by the mention of the beastly practice of drinking blood, to represent the Philistines under the image of a wild beast, who holds fast his prey with his teeth. In this way, he points out, that idolatry was deeply rooted among the Philistines. "Also he will be left for our God," is a concise expression for "also he will not entirely perish, but a remnant of him will be preserved, in order that he may, at a future period return to the true God." גַּם is referred by several interpreters to the Israelites, a remnant of whom, according to the frequent predictions of the prophets, (comp. Is. 10 : 21, 22, 11 : 11, 28 : 5,) should repent and be preserved during the heavy judgments of God,

which were coming upon them. But this reference is so distant, that the prophet, who had said nothing of this before, could not have expected himself to be understood. The only correct one is, that to the lands mentioned before, Hadrach, Syria, Phœnicia. By these few words the prophet discloses the prospect of their future conversion. Parallel is chap. 14: 9, "Then will the Lord be king over the whole earth." In the words: "and he will be as a prince of a tribe in Judah," the thought that the Philistines would hereafter be received among the covenant people, and enjoy equal privileges with them, is expressed as though their representative, their ideal head, should obtain the dignity of a prince in Judah. (See on אַלּוּף at chap. 12: 6.) A similar mode of representation prevails Matth. 2: 6, where Bethlehem is called the least ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, which, in like manner, can be explained only by supposing a personification of the city. — Much the same thought is expressed by the last member: "Ekron will be as the Jebusites." The Jebusites, the ancient inhabitants of Jerusalem, had, until the time of David, dwelt at Jerusalem with the Jews, who could not expel them. They were vanquished by David, and a remnant of them, after they had embraced the religion of the Israelities, was incorporated into the Theocracy. This appears from the example of Araunah the Jebusite, who, 2 Sam. 24, 1 Chron. 21, dwelt among the covenant people as a respectable and wealthy man, and whose estate was destined by David for the site of the future temple. Others, as Rosenmüller, after the example of Theodoret, prefer to understand by the Jebusites, the later inhabitants of the city Jebus, the Israelites. The sense would then be: The inhabitants of Ekron shall enter into the same relation to the Lord, as the inhabitants of Jerusalem; the Philistines, at a future period, shall belong to the covenant people as well as the Israelites. But, not only is there no instance where the later inhabitants of Jerusalem are called Jebusites, but this designation, as Mark has already observed, is here entirely out of place, since it would not be honorable, as the context requires, but degrading. — Similar transitions from the representation of the judgments, which threatened the heathen nations, to the prediction of their future reception into the kingdom of God, for which all their humiliations are only preparatory, and which, as the termination of all the dealings of God, first place in their true light the preceding events, are elsewhere also not rarely found, comp. e. g. Is. 19: 18, seq. 23: 15, Jer. 12: 15, 16.

V. 8. "*And I establish for my house an encampment against the invading foe; no oppression shall any more overcome them; for now I see with mine eyes.*" חָנָה with עַל "to establish a camp *against*," with לְ "*for* any one, in order to his protection." The same figurative designation of protection is found, Ps. 34:8, and a similar one, chap. 2:9, where the Lord promises, that he will be to Jerusalem like a wall of fire. "The house of the Lord" is the temple restored by Zerubbabel. צָבָה only a different orthography for צָבָא, *host*. This supposition is the more tenable, since also Is. 29:7, צָבָה, *militari*, occurs for צָבָא, and it is therefore unnecessary, with Ch. B. Michaelis and Winer, to take מִצָּבָה as a noun, derived from נָצַב, in the sense *statio militum*, which is opposed not only by the absence of the word elsewhere, but also by a much more important reason, the unsuitableness of the connexion with חֲנִיתִי, in whatever way it may be understood. מִן, in מִצָּבָא and the two following words, may be understood in two ways, either *from*, since in חָנָה the idea of deliverance and protection is included, or with Mark: "*absque, ita ut non sit amplius*," comp. the examples in Ewald, p. 599. The latter interpretation is favored by the occurrence of מִן in this sense, chap. 7:14, in the phrase מֵעֹבֵר וּמָשָׁב. These words are referred by several interpreters especially to the expeditions of the conquering nations against other states, particularly against the neighbouring Egypt, which in former times caused the Israelites much suffering. But the comparison of the other passages where the phrase occurs, Ezek. 35:7, Zech. 7:14, shows, that it has a more general sense; and signifies intercourse in general, which is here determined by the connexion to be of a hostile character. Appropriately Calvin: "*Quamvis ergo totus mundus conspiret ac coeant hinc inde magnæ copiæ hostium, jubet tamen tranquillo animo bene sperare, quoniam unus deus sufficit ad profligandos omnes exercitus.*" עַתָּה, *nunc*, refers, not so well to the time when the prophecy was spoken, as to that of the fulfilment, when the Lord established his camp around his house. This is explained from the nature of prophecy, in which the future appears as present; the determinations of time, therefore, relate not to the actual, but to the ideal present. The phrase, "for now I see," &c., (comp. הִנֵּה רָאִיתִי, Jer. 7:11,) is spoken after the manner of men. When a friend sees the misfortune of a friend, he comes to his help. Hence in the Psalms, we frequently find the supplication, "behold my affliction," for, "deliver me from it."

V. 9. "*Rejoice greatly, thou daughter of Zion, shout for joy,*

thou daughter of Jerusalem. Behold thy king comes to thee, he is just and protected of God, afflicted and riding upon an ass, and upon a foal the son of a she ass." We cannot better give the sense of the whole verse, than in the words of Calvin: "*Summa est, vaticinia, quibus spem redemtionis fecerat deus electo populo, non esse vana aut irrita, quoniam tandem suo tempore prodibit Christus, filius Davidis. Secundo regem hunc fore justum et salvum, quia scilicet restituet in ordinem, quæ prius fœdo et pudendo modo erant confusa. Tertio adjungit regem hunc fore pauperem, quia equitabit super asinum et non pollebit magna eminentia, neque erit conspicuus vel armis, vel opibus, vel lautitiis, vel copia militari, vel etiam regiis insignibus, quæ perstringunt vulgi oculos.*" The preliminary exhortation to exulting joy intimates the importance of the subject, and at the same time the greatness of the necessity, which should be satisfied with this gracious benefit of God. Cocceius has already reminded us, that the exhortation contains also a prophecy. The prophet had in view only the better part of the covenant people, the true members of the Theocracy, not the whole of the natural Israelites. On this account he gives prominence only to the joy and salvation, which the Messiah's Advent will bring. — The evangelists, who were concerned only with the substance of the prophecy, have not verbally rendered this exhortation to joy. Matthew has instead, from Is. 62 : 11 : εἴπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών. John: μὴ φοβοῦ, θύγατερ Σιών. הִנֵּה indicates, that the prophet sees the future king already present, and about to make his entrance into Jerusalem. "*Thy* king" with peculiar emphasis: "he, who alone in the complete and highest sense is thy king, so that all others scarcely deserve this name," comp. Ps. 45 : 72. The expression at the same time shows, that the prophet speaks of a king generally known from the former prophecies, and eagerly expected. לָךְ not merely "to thee," but also, "for thy benefit, for thy salvation;" comp. Is. 9 : 5, "A child is born to *us*, a son is given to *us*." The prophet here exhibits only the blessings, which the Messiah should confer upon the believing portion of the covenant people, because his prophecy was chiefly, and in the first instance, designed for them. That the heathen to be received into the kingdom of God should also participate in these blessings appears from v. 7 and 10. יָבֹא does not here refer, as Mal. 3 : 1, to the coming of the Messiah in glory for judgment, but, as the following epithets show, to his first appearance in obscurity. צַדִּיק, *just*, designates the first virtue

of a king, and is therefore made particularly prominent in the prophecies where the Messiah appears as a king, as Ps. 45 : 72, Jer. 23 : 5, Is. 11 : 3 – 5. We cannot here, like many older interpreters, (see e. g. Mark *in loco*,) compare those passages where the righteousness of the Messiah, as a high priest, and at the same time as a sacrifice for sin is spoken of, particularly Is. 53 : 11, "He the righteous one, my servant, will make many righteous." This was seen by Calvin : "*Ceterum nolo hic argutius disserere de fidei justitia. Potius enim existimo hac voce notari rectum ordinem, quum omnia essent tunc confusa in populo.*" נוֹשָׁע has ever given much employment to the interpreters. The different views have been collected with great completeness by Meinhard, *Messias Salvatus Salvator*, Wittenb. 1681, (see also Mark on the passage.) 1. The interpretation has been very widely diffused, which takes the *partic.* in Niph. as standing precisely for the *partic.* in Hiph. מוֹשִׁיעַ. (It is known that Kal never occurs.) Thus the Seventy, *σώζων*; Jerome, *salvator; Jonath.* פָּרִיק, *servator*; likewise the Syriac : and Luther translates *helper*. Winer, *Lex. s. v., conqueror*. One of the chief defenders of this interpretation is Frischmuth, in the valuable *Dissertatio de Messia rege Sionis*, Jena, 1678, reprinted in the *Thesaurus* (*ant.*) *Theol. Phil. t.* I. p. 1061, *sqq*. But this view is certainly altogether untenable. The assertion of several of its earlier defenders, that Niph. may stand precisely for Kal, needs now no further refutation. Only on one ground could it be sustained with any degree of plausibility. It is known, that the passive sense of Niph. frequently passes over into the reflexive, which may be readily occasioned by regarding merely the effect, without respect to the agent. Comp. the examples of the reflexive in Ewald, p. 192. We might accordingly here give to נוֹשָׁע the meaning "to deliver himself." Thus Bauer has actually done, *Schol. ad h. l. : servans se ipsum, h. e. servator*. But the very manner in which the reflexive meaning originates, shows that Niph. as a reflexive form cannot always be employed, where we place *himself*. This even Ewald confesses, p. 192, although, in which he is certainly wrong, he regards the reflexive sense as the original. "If this pronoun has more emphasis than the idea conveyed by the verb, the *pron. reflexivum* נַפְשׁוֹ must be used ; e. g. 'to kill one's self' can be expressed neither in Greek by the middle voice, nor in Hebrew by a reflexive form." In addition to this there is another ground. The reflexive sense, in general, is not found in all verbs. Hence, before it is applied in the interpretation of a doubt-

ful passage, the inquiry must always be made, whether it occurs elsewhere also; and, if this is not the case, though the verb is often used, the application of the reflexive sense, if not absolutely inadmissible, is so at all events where the context does not imperatively require it. The verb יָשַׁע, however, occurs in Niph. not less than twenty times, and never in the reflexive, but always in the passive sense. Even the *partic.* is found in the latter sense, Ps. 33 : 16. Lastly, the prophet had no reason whatever to employ the *part.* in Niph. in an unusual sense, since had this been the case, מוֹשִׁיעַ was at his command, which occurs in more than thirty places. Certainly the authority of the old translators is not in the least degree suited to outweigh these arguments. Their interpretation rested on the same ground as the opinion of so many recent interpreters, that נוֹשָׁע is to be taken actively; comp. e. g. Frischmuth on the passage: "*Aperte liquet longe majorem lætitiam oriri, si rex ille salvator appelletur, quam si ipsummet salvatum esse significetur.*" It would scarcely have occurred, at least it would not have been so perseveringly held, unless interpreters had believed, that the choice lay only between it and the following, the difficulties of which they perceived. 2. Numerous other interpreters take נוֹשָׁע correctly as passive, and, indeed, in the sense *delivered.* Thus e. g., among the Jews, Kimchi: "*in justitia sua salvatus a gladio Gog et Magog.*" Most Christian interpreters refer it to the deliverance of the Messiah from the severest sufferings by his resurrection and glorification. So, Calovius, Meinhard, Cocceius, S. Glassius, Ch. B. Michaelis, and, among the recent authors, Jahn. The sense, according to this interpretation, has been best developed by Glassius: (*Phil. S. l.* 1, tr. 1.) "*Gaudio huic obstare poterat miseria illa atque humilitas, in qua tunc temporis salvator noster constitutus erat. Hoc igitur scandalum aversurus propheta verbo passivo utitur* נוֹשָׁע; *h. e. rex venit justus, humilis, pauper. Noli autem ob id animo concidere. Noli offendi exteriore schemate. Ecce enim salvatus est, h. e. ex hac paupertate et misera conditione ad supremam gloriam cœlestem tam certo tandem evehetur post hanc passionem et mortem, ac si jam salvatus ac glorificatus esset.*" The objection raised against this interpretation by Mark, that it does not plainly enough express the destination of the Messiah to be for salvation and consolation to his people, which ought here to be expected, is unsatisfactory. He alleges, that with the deliverance of one's self, the ability to deliver others is not always connected; the deliverance might indeed appertain only to the per-

son of the king. This objection has already been admirably refuted by Calvin : " *Pendet utrumque verbum ab illo, venturum regem Sioni. Si veniret sibi privatim, esset etiam sibi justus et servatus, h. e. utilitas justitiæ et salutis resideret penes ipsum solum, vel in ejus persona. Sed quum aliorum respectu venerit, etiam in eorum gratiam et justitia et salute præditus est.*" But it was not so easy to remove another objection. According to this interpretation, the predicate נוֹשָׁע would refer only to the state of glorification. This, however, is entirely unsuitable, since the following predicates refer to the state of humiliation. 3. Others take נוֹשָׁע also as a passive, but not in the sense, *delivered*, but, *sustained, endowed with salvation.* So Münster : " *salute circumdatus, invictus, ubique salvatus ab insidiatoribus suis.*" De Dieu : " *quem deus munit auxilio suo, ne pereat.*" Calvin : " *Quatenus missus est a patre, ut colligeret electum populum, ita etiam vocatur incolumis, quoniam instructus est potentia ad salvandum.*" Similar also Mark, only that he erroneously asserts, that נוֹשָׁע is here not a participle, but a *nomen verbale adjectivum*, a supposition, which is only so far correct as that the *particip.* when it does not stand as a predicate in the sentence, and is consequently treated and connected as a verb, approaches more nearly to the noun in Hebrew, since it never of itself conveys the idea of a definite time, but equally comprehends all times ; comp. Ewald, p. 538. This interpretation is fully confirmed by philology. Niph. occurs also elsewhere in the sense, " sustained with help, favored with salvation." Thus Deut. 33 : 29, " Salvation to thee, O Israel, who is like unto thee? עַם נוֹשַׁע בַּיהוָה, a people which is clothed with salvation by the Lord, (ביהוה also in the passage before us is to be supplied,) thy helping shield, thy proud sword ;" see Is. 45 : 7 ; Jer. 23 : 6 ; Ps. 33 : 16. It is well known, that הוֹשִׁיעַ often is used of the aid of God in general, not merely one particular deliverance. This interpretation gives a sense in the highest degree appropriate. Especially is the reason then evident of the connexion of צַדִּיק with נוֹשָׁע. As righteousness and salvation are ascribed to the invisible head of the Theocracy, as the sum of those attributes whereby he makes his people happy, (comp. e. g. Is. 45 : 21, אֵל־צַדִּיק וּמוֹשִׁיעַ), so was it the highest glory of his visible representative to be clothed by him inwardly with righteousness, (comp. Ps. 72 : 1,) and outwardly with salvation, which flows forth from him to his subjects. In both respects the Messiah should be perfectly, what the best previous kings had been only very im-

perfectly. What the defenders of the interpretation cited under No. 2, affirm to be the only sense of the word, is also included in it according to the interpretation which has just been given. The deliverance of the Messiah from death and his glorification is only one particular effect, one necessary consequence, of the divine aid which he enjoyed, and which accompanied him even in his deepest humiliation. Parallel is Is. 53 : 2, where it is said of the Messiah, he has grown up לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, *vidente et adjuvante domino*, (see on the passage.)

While the first two predicates express that which was common to the great king of future times with the best of those who had reigned before, the two latter were designed to point out wherein he was characteristically different from them. עָנִי is supposed by numerous interpreters to be synonymous with עָנָו, *meek*. Thus the Seventy, πραΰς, or πράος. Jon. ענוותן, Syr. *humilis*. Also Kimchi, who compares Is. 42 : 2, and most other Jewish interpreters; those, however, excepted, (which deserves attention, as suggesting the ground of this interpretation,) who, as R. Moses Hakkohen and Abenezra, do not refer the prophecy to the Messiah just because the predicate of *lowliness*, in their opinion, undeniably contained in עָנִי, does not agree with him; among the older Christian interpreters, Frischmuth, and lastly, the whole body of rationalists, comp. e. g. Gesen. and Winer, s. v. There can, however, be no doubt, that this interpretation is completely arbitrary. Among the numerous passages in which עָנִי occurs, there is not one in which it can be said, even with any plausibility, that it has the sense of עָנָו. True, the Massorites have designated two passages as such, where עָנָו stands for עָנִי, and two, where עָנִי stands for עָנָו. But a closer examination of these shows at once, that this assertion is without foundation. Luther has translated, Num. 12 : 3, עָנָו by *afflicted*, as synonymous with עָנִי. But this translation is now generally acknowledged erroneous, and originated only in the effort to rescue Moses from the appearance of boasting. It is the less necessary for us to bring forward all the proofs, since Gesenius and Winer, by citing in favor of this interpretation only this passage, silently confess that it is not sustained by a single example. It is true, that in Hebrew the subordinate idea of innocence and humility is connected (see on v. 2) with the idea of poverty and wretchedness; but then the principal idea is never lost sight of; nowhere is a rich and powerful man called עָנִי, and yet this is precisely what must be as-

sumed in this passage.* It appears, therefore, since this interpretation is so entirely destitute of all support, and since, as we shall soon see, it is refuted also by the parallelism, that its origin and continued prevalence can be explained only from doctrinal prejudice. The few Christian interpreters who approved it, among whom we must not reckon those, who, as Chrysostom, used only the Septuagint, would not have done so, if they had not been led astray by their prejudiced predecessors. The ground which Frischmuth advances for his interpretation: "*non paupertas, sed mansuetudo est causa lætitiæ,*" is done away by the remark, that each particular predicate need not have contained something which was a direct occasion for joy. It was sufficient if the prediction on the whole opened a rich source of joy. This could not be disturbed by the lowliness of the Messiah, since notwithstanding this the prophet, like Is. chap. 53, makes him extend his kingdom over the whole earth, and had already guarded against every stumblingblock by the foregoing נִוֹשִׁיעַ. Calvin: "*Si ergo Christus pauper est, non potest suos servare incolumes, neque etiam ipse florere in regno suo. Unde sequitur instructum fore cœlesti potentia, ut integer ipse maneat et prohibeat etiam omnes injurias ab ecclesia sua.*" How far a doctrinal interest has influenced the Jewish and rationalist interpreters we shall hereafter see. Nor is *poor*, by which, after Jerome and Symmachus, many other interpreters translate עָנִי, entirely correct. עָנִי is of wider import; it signifies the whole of the low, miserable, suffering condition of the Messiah, as it is more fully described, Is. 53: 2, 3. — The second predicate, *riding on an ass*, is taken by many interpreters as a designation of an humble, *peaceful* king. So Chrysostom, merely, however, because he was influenced by the Alexandrine version of עָנִי, and so compelled here to find

* Very appositely Hulsius, Theol. Jud. p. 163: "Sane agnoscimus paupertatis et humilitatis qualitates, sicut utriusque vocabula in Hebræo admodum vicina sunt, sic quoque necessitatis vinculo connexas in eodem subjecto concurrere, adeo ut si non proprie, saltem non inepte LXX. עָנִי reddiderint per πραΰς s. πραΰς (whence the retaining of this translation by Matthew is explained, for whose purpose an accurate discrimination was not important). Velle tamen vocabulorum significationes inter se confundere, ita ut עָנִי, proprie *pauper*, hic tantum improprie notet humilem, et quidem cum omnimoda paupertatis exclusione, illud non concedimus, neque vocis עָנִי natura hoc patitur, quæ non *virtute* humilem (id enim עָנָו significat) sed *conditione* humilem, h. e. pauperem, oppressum, abjectæ sortis hominem denotat;" comp. Cellarius, De Gemino Jud. Messia, § 13, 14.

something corresponding to πραΰς: *Οὐχὶ ἅρματα ἐλαύνων ὡς οἱ λοιποὶ βασιλεῖς, οὐ φόρους ἀπαιτῶν, οὐ σοβῶν καὶ δορυφόρους περιάγων, ἀλλὰ πολλὴν τὴν ἐπιείκειαν κἀντεῦθεν ἐπιδεικνύμενος.* (*Opp. ed. Francof. t. I. N. T.* p. 718.) Kimchi: "*Insidens super asino, non præ inopia, quia totus mundus in potestate ejus est, sed præ mansuetudine sedebit super asino.*" Generally all those Jewish interpreters who adopt the Messianic interpretation, and with them Frischmuth. Grotius: "*Id non tantum significabat modestiam ipsius, sed et pacis studium; nam bello armantur equi; asinus pacis animal.*" Likewise all rationalists, without exception, whom Jahn also in contradiction to himself, since he gives the true meaning of עָנִי, has been induced to follow. In favor of this interpretation, it has been urged, that the ass in the East is altogether a different animal from what he is with us; that in the Scripture even the most eminent men appear as riding on asses, and that this is still the case, according to the testimony of travellers. But it is evident from the following reasons, that this interpretation is inadmissible, and that riding on an ass signifies rather the low condition of the king. (Calvin: "*Quasi diceret, regem, de quo loquitur, non fore magnifico et splendido apparatu insignem, ut solent esse terreni principes, sed quasi sordido habitu, aut saltem vulgari, ut nihil differat a plebejo quopiam et ignobili.*") 1. This view is favored by the very connexion in which עָנִי stands. Mark very justly observes: "*Alter hujus regis character externus est specialis, ex priori generali fluens.*" If now the translation of עָנִי by *meek* is inadmissible, then riding on an ass cannot designate one particular manifestation of humility and meekness, but rather that of lowliness and inferiority. 2. It is indeed true, that the ass in the East is of a nobler nature, and therefore more esteemed than with us. But still he ever remains an ass, and cannot rise to the dignity of a horse. Since the appearance of Michaelis's History of the Horse and of the breeding of Horses in Palestine, (hinter Th. 3, von d. Mos. R.) it has no longer been customary to appeal to the passages of Scripture, in which distinguished persons appear as riding upon asses. During the dominion of the Judges the horse had not yet been brought into use among the Israelites, *therefore* even men of rank made use of the ass for riding. With the rise of the regal dominion, first mules and then horses came into use. From this period, particularly from the reign of Solomon, we no longer find even a single example of a royal, or, in general, of a very eminent person riding on an ass. And yet examples of this

date would alone be of importance in the present instance. With respect to the accounts of recent travellers, it is to be considered, that they generally speak of the ass only relatively with reference to the extreme contempt in which he is held by us. When they relate, that in the East even distinguished women are accustomed to use him, nothing can be inferred in reference to this passage; that there is another reason for this than the nobleness of the ass, is evident from the fact, that this also happens among us, notwithstanding he is the object of the greatest contempt; that even the higher officers in particular regions of the East, according to Chardin's account of the lawyers in Persia, make use of the ass for riding, can only prove that this practice is not there, as with us, *ridiculous*. It is explained by the circumstance, that the ass in the East runs tolerably fast, is better suited than the horse for riding, especially on the mountains, on account of his being more surefooted, and moreover is easily kept, and with very little expense. Of a king who generally rode upon an ass, our accounts of the Oriental ass, which are particularly full (comp. the proofs e. g. in Jahn, *Arch.* 1, p. 275 seq. in the *Goth. bibl. Encycl.* and in Winer's *Reallex.* s. v.), do not afford a single example; nor an instance where a magistrate of a higher order mounted an ass on a solemn occasion, though here it is to be well observed, that riding on the ass is predicated of the king, as king. On the contrary, proofs are not wanting, that the ass in the East also shares in a measure in the contempt, in which his more unfortunate brother in the West is held. The very etymology of עָיִט, *laziness*, (comp. Ges. *Thes.* s. v.) expresses this contempt. A proof drawn from the most ancient time is furnished by Gen. 49: 13. When Issachar is there called "an ass," the *tertium comparationis*, as the context shows, is plainly, not merely strength of bones, but likewise that laziness, which will not suffer its repose to be disturbed at any price, and patiently endures whatever burden is imposed upon it. Still more provokingly is the honor of the ass attacked by Jesus, the son of Sirach, chap. 23 : 25, "To the ass belongs his fodder, whip, and burden." Mohammed says, "The voice of the ass is the most abominable of all, yea it is the voice of the Devil," (comp. Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* s. v. *Hemor.*) The ancient Egyptians asserted, that the evil god, Typhon, was like an ass, and that this animal was peculiarly agreeable to him, (*Jablonsky, Pantheon Æg. III.* 45.) That Christians and Jews in Egypt, by way of degradation, are confined to the use of the ass, while the

horse is reserved only for the Mahommedans, is well known. The extravagance of the prevailing view of the Oriental dignity of the ass, appears especially from King Sapor's mockery of the Messiah of the Jews riding on the ass, comp. *Sankedrin* XI. fol. 98: "*Dixit rex Sapores Rab. Samueli: Dicitis Messiam super asino venturum. Ego mittam isti equum splendidum, quem habeo.*" — Finally, an observation of Mark is worthy of attention: "*Multum differt asinus præstans, insessioni assuetus, atque decenti ephippio et ornamentis instructus pretiosis, a qualicunque vili et indomito,*" &c. But, should any doubt remain respecting the import of riding on the ass, it must surely vanish, when we look at the fulfilment. We can scarcely conceive of any thing more humble, than the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem. The city, into which David and Solomon had so often rode on mules or horses splendidly adorned, attended by a multitude of proud horsemen, the Lord entered on a borrowed ass, which had never yet been rode; the poor garments of his disciples supplied the place of the usual covering; his train consisted of those, who were regarded by the world as the people and rabble. In every feature of the symbolic action is manifested the design of the Lord to represent his kingdom as destitute of all worldly splendor, as poor and lowly; so that Heumann on John 12: 15, justly remarks: "This deed of the Lord can be regarded as an *ironia realis*, whereby the false imagination of the Jews respecting the Messiah's kingdom was derided."

The two members, "he rides on an ass," and "on a young ass, a foal of the she asses," sustain to each other the relation of a climax. It is a great sign of poverty and abasement when a king rides on an ass, in general; but it is a far greater one, when the animal is young and has never yet been rode. This interpretation is plainly grounded in the words. Without it the last proposition has no meaning. *Vau* often stands in climaxes, e. g. 1 Kings 8: 27. "Behold the heaven, *and* the heaven of heavens, contain thee not." Prov. 6: 16. "Six things and seven," for, yea seven; comp. other examples in Ewald, p. 654; Winer s. v. עַיִר, signifies of itself a young ass. Partly, however, because the word had gradually come to be used in a more general sense, partly because the youth of the animal was here especially to be brought into view, the prophet still subjoins בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת. The *plur.* אֲתֹנוֹת has here led to strange interpretations. That of Michaelis, Bauer, and Jahn, borders on the ridiculous, according to which, "a foal of the she asses," signifies,

"a foal of a good stock," whose mother is known for some generations back! Of the genealogy of asses hitherto, at least, no trace has been found; but, were it otherwise, and could it at the same time be shown that regard was paid not to the male, but only to the female ancestors, still this sense would be directly opposed to the design of the passage, which is to represent the lowly condition of the king. Others, as Grotius and Ammon: "*non mulo, sed asino vectus, tam ex patre quam ex matre*," as though חֲמוֹר and עַיִר did not entirely exclude the mule, and as though the אָתוֹן no less designated the male than the female ass. The plural is not seldom placed where only one undetermined individual, out of a multitude, is meant, and where it is not important to be more definite; comp. Ewald, p. 584. Thus e. g. Gen. 21 : 7, "who would have said to Abraham, Sarah gives suck to sons," בָּנִים. Sarah had only one son, the number however of her children was not here important, but only the fact of her becoming fruitful, and this was rendered the more striking by the use of the plural. Completely analogous, however, is the frequently occurring בֶּן־בָּקָר *filius boum*, for *vitulus bovinus*, also עֵגֶל בֶּן בָּקָר and פַּר בֶּן בָּקָר. Likewise פֶּרֶא אֲרָיוֹת, Judges 14 : 5. In the passage before us only the relation was considered, not the other exponent of this relation; this, therefore, could be indefinitely and generally designated. The comparison of בֶּן־בָּקָר shows, that by בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת an ass is designated, whose relation to his mother was the most important thing to be considered. For the same reason as here, viz. in order the more strongly to express the mean condition of the king, by the Evangelists, also, the youth of the ass is carefully exhibited. John: ὀνάριον: Mark 11 : 12, πῶλον, ἐφ᾽ ὃν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων κεκάθικε. Luke 19 : 30, ἐφ᾽ ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισε, That there must be a reason for this, interpreters have always perceived. In discovering it, however, they have not, for the most part, been very successful. Justin and several later fathers, whom Paulus is strangely inclined to follow, found in the she ass a type of the Jewish people; in the ass, which had not been rode, a symbol of the heathen. More plausibly Bengel, after Bochart and others: "*Integra sint oportet a miasmatis corporum peccaminosorum, quæ Christo inserviunt.*" But, besides that this feature would not here be suitable, where every thing points to the extreme humiliation of the king, this reference must be rejected, because it disregards the passage of Zechariah, which the Lord so plainly had in view during the whole transaction. According to the general opinion of the

older and later interpreters, *vau* has here the sense of *namely*, and therefore in both members one and the same ass is spoken of. This meaning might, if necessary, be justified on grammatical principles; for, although *vau* never occurs precisely in the sense *namely*, (see Ew. l. c.) yet, in many instances, though retaining its ordinary meaning, it can be translated by *et quidem*. Still, however, this interpretation would never have arisen, if interpreters, proceeding on the supposition that the passage relates immediately and exclusively to the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem, and observing that only one ass is mentioned by three of the Evangelists, had not feared that prophecy and fulfilment might be involved in contradiction. The former supposition, however, is plainly erroneous. The riding on the ass, is here, in the first instance, a mere individualization of the foregoing עָנִי. If now, it were a bare synonymous parallelism, the supposition, that, in both members, one and the same ass is spoken of would be utterly untenable. When it is said, Gen. 49: 11, of Judah, "He binds his ass to the vine, the foal of his she ass to the choice vine, he washes his garment in wine, his dress in the blood of grapes"; who would not regard as ridiculous the assertion, that "the ass" and "the ass's foal" are the same individual, "the vine" and "the choice vine" one and the same, "the blood of grapes" and "the wine" the same portion of wine, "garment" and "dress" one and the same piece of clothing. But this supposition must appear the more inadmissible in this passage, since, as we have shown, it contains a climax; as the prophet first designates the low condition of the Messiah, by his riding either on an ass in general, or on a full-grown ass, and then more strongly by his riding on a young one, which had never been rode; and to this must be added, that the repetition of עַל does not accord with the supposition that the *vau* is exegetical. It can scarcely be denied, that the Lord himself has confirmed our view by the manner in which the symbolic action was performed, which should, as it were, embody the figurative representation of Zechariah. It cannot otherwise be explained why he commanded, according to Matthew, that not only the young ass, but also the she ass should be brought. He could mount only one of the two animals. For the change, as Bochart has already remarked, (Hieroz. 2: 17,) would have been unbecoming in so short a distance. He chose the young ass, because in Zechariah this was the symbol of the deepest humiliation. The she ass, however must accompany it, in order fully to represent the image of

Zechariah, and to make visible the climax, which he had employed. That the she ass made a necessary part of the symbolic action, and was not taken along for some subordinate object, — that the foal might the more readily follow, as most interpreters suppose, — is evident from the words of Matthew, v. 7: *Ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον, καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν.* Otherwise, even were we to refer the second *αὐτῶν* to the garments, (Theophylact: *οὐχὶ τῶν δύο ὑποζυγίων, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἱματίων,*) an interpretation which could have arisen only from embarrassment, still the first *αὐτῶν* would remain inexplicable. The usual expedient that the *plur.* stands for the *sing.*, is scarcely tenable. In support of it, examples are appealed to like those cited at p. 99. But these are not to the purpose; there the *plur.* is used, because a more accurate determination of the particular subject was unimportant; and for this usage not a few examples can be cited from the New Testament also, (comp. Winer, *Gramm.* p. 149.) Here, on the contrary, it was in the highest degree necessary to be definite, if the Evangelist wished to express that the Lord rode only on the foal. The use of the plural can, therefore, have no other object, than to show that both animals were destined for the use of the Lord; so that with the one, the other also, as it were, was covered with garments and mounted. That the other Evangelists do not indeed mention the she ass can prove nothing. John narrates, in general, with extreme brevity, and omits all subordinate circumstances. He presupposes the facts to be known, and only subjoins the remark, that the reference of the symbolic action to the Old Testament prophecy, was first made clear to the disciples after the glorification of the Lord. Mark and Luke entirely omit the reference to the prophecy, which Matthew, in accordance with the object, and uniform character of his Gospel, (comp. Hug, *Einl.* 2, p. 7 sqq., ed. 2,) renders especially prominent. Under these circumstances the mention of the she ass would have been inappropriate; since the design of her accompanying the foal would be evident only from the reference to the prophecy; far more important was it to extol the wonderful circumstances with which the event was attended.

V. 10. "*And I abolish the chariots from Ephraim, and the horses from Jerusalem, and the battle-bow shall cease; and he speaks peace to the nations, and his dominion extends from sea to sea, from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth.*" The prophet proceeds to give the characteristic difference of the Messianic from all worldly king-

doms, and especially from the former Theocracy; whether with special reference to the carnal conceptions of his contemporaries is uncertain. While earthly kingdoms are upheld and extended only by the power of arms, while even the Theocracy formerly employed them, it shall in the time of the Messiah, be deprived of every external weapon, since it will need them no more, because its head, the Prince of Peace, by his bare word extends peace over the whole earth, which willingly and joyfully submits to him. The words, "I abolish, — battle-bow," have been by many interpreters entirely misunderstood. By those, e. g. who, after Theodoret, (Ἐξωλόθρευσεν ἅρματα ἐξ Ἐφραΐμ καὶ ἵππον ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, τὴν θρασύτητα αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν μανικὴν καταλύσας βασιλείαν), and Eusebius, (Ταῦτα γὰρ περὶ τῆς καθαιρεσέως τῆς βασιλικῆς ἀξίας τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνους ἐθεσπίζετο,) find in these words a prediction of the political extinction of the covenant people by the Romans. In like manner, by those who, as Grotius, after the Chald.: "*Conteram facientes bella et castra populorum*," and the Seventy, (Ἐξολοθρευθήσεται τόξον πολεμικὸν καὶ πλῆθος καὶ εἰρήνη ἐξ ἐθνῶν,) are reminded of hostile chariots and cavalry, and explain the phrase, "to abolish out of Ephraim," &c., by "to make harmless for," &c. What follows, where the kingdom of the Messiah is designated as a kingdom of peace, shows, that, by the abolition of the war-chariots, &c., the entire uselessness of every external weapon is signified. This explanation is confirmed also by the parallel passages. Entirely analogous is Is. 2 : 4, Mich. 4 : 3, "Then will the Lord be a judge between the people, and rebuke many nations; they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; no people will lift up the sword against another, they will learn war no more." This passage is also so far explanatory of the one before us, as that there the reason of the destruction of all warlike apparatus precedes, and therefore can the less be mistaken, while here it follows. Further, Hosea 2 : 20, "I make for them a covenant with the wild beasts," &c., "and will abolish bow and sword and war, out of the land, and cause them to dwell securely." Likewise, Is. 9 : 4, (comp. Vol. I. p. 356.) Similar for the most part, according to the words, is Mic. 5 : 9, and was probably present to the mind of Zechariah: nevertheless, according to the sense, it so far differs, as that there the extinction of the warlike apparatus is predicted with a special regard to the sinful confidence placed upon it by the covenant people. — That no argument against the genuineness of the second part can

be derived from the connexion of Judah and Ephraim, has already been shown in the *Beiträge*, 1, p. 377. — The subject in וְדִבֶּר is the king. The verb is here emphatic. What worldly kings effect by the power of arms, he accomplishes by his bare word; comp. Ps. 148 : 5, 33 : 9, and especially, Is. 11 : 4, (comp. Vol. I. 379.) The emphasis arises from the character of the person who speaks. The expression, דִּבֶּר שָׁלוֹם לְ, occurs besides only in Esth. 10 : 3, according to the right interpretation, of the settling of controversies. Comp., respecting peace as a characteristic mark of the Messiah's time, Volume I. p. 295. The last part of the verse, "and his dominion," &c., has suffered various false interpretations. Abenezra explains: "*A mari, scil. australi, quod vocatur Sodomæum, usque ad mare septentrionale, h. e. usque ad Oceanum, et a fluvio, h. e. Euphrate, ubi est principium Orientis, usque ad extrema terræ.*" Calvin: "*A mari rubro usque ad mare Syriacum.*" Eichhorn: "He reigns from one sea to the other, from the (great) river to the end of the land. Israel's kingdom receives through Jehovah its greatest extension; from the Dead to the Mediterranean Sea; from the Euphrates to the deserts of Arabia." In like manner, Eckermann, Bauer, Kuinöl, and, for reasons easily to be conjectured, most other rationalist and rationalizing interpreters; but in opposition to this explanation we offer the following arguments, which in part apply also to that of Abenezra. 1. אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ never occurs of the boundaries of the Jewish kingdom, but always stands for the extreme limits of the whole earth, (comp. Vol. I. p. 81.) 2. As, therefore, in the second member the *terminus ad quem* is, in general, the widest possible, so in the second member, it cannot lie within the bounds of Palestine. The second יָם must rather designate the most distant sea. 3. As the whole sentence is repeated verbatim, Ps. 72 : 8, and Zechariah must therefore have had that passage in view, we are fully justified in making use of it in the interpretation. There, however, according to the following context, not merely Palestine, but the whole earth, with all its people and lands, shall be subject to the king, (Vol. I. 102.) 4. To understand by מִיָּם עַד יָם "from the Dead or from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean," is inadmissible on grammatical grounds alone. It is indeed true, that the article is often omitted in poetry, even when a definite noun is the subject of discourse; comp. Ges. *Lehrg.* p. 652; Ewald, p. 568. But this happens only in cases where the definite noun may be sufficiently known as such without the article. An example is readily furnished

by נָהָר. This cannot signify any river at pleasure; every one sees at once that it can be referred only to the Euphrates. This was called הַנָּהָר, *the river* κατ' ἐξοχήν. This appellative appellation was sometimes in poetry regarded as a proper name, and only in this way could the article be omitted; comp. Ewald, p. 569; Jer. 2: 18, Is. 7: 20, Mic. 7: 12. So also must the first יָם, if it is to stand for a definite sea, designate one, which, in the prevailing usage, appears as the sea κατ' ἐξοχήν. This, however, is neither the Red nor the Dead Sea, which never occur without a more particular designation, but only the Mediterranean, which frequently occurs as הַיָּם הַגָּדוֹל, or barely הַיָּם, (comp. Ges. and Win. s. v.) 5. There is a plain reference to the passages where the boundaries of the former Theocracy are given; the author takes two of the limits there given, and then, instead of the opposite ones, he subjoins two others far more extensive, and coinciding with the bounds of the earth, (Vol. I. 102.) If now we compare these passages, (Ex. 23: 31; Gen. 15: 18; Deut. 11: 24; Josh. 1: 4; 2 Kings 5: 1,) it appears that in them the Euphrates is uniformly mentioned as the one boundary, the Mediterranean Sea as the other. In one instance only the Arabian gulf occurs in connexion with the latter. Even for this reason the Mediterranean Sea alone can be understood by the first יָם. Finally, to this must be added, that also in the parallel passages, Mic. 7: 12, Amos 8: 12, the phrase, "from sea to sea," occurs in the sense "over the whole earth," so far as it is surrounded by seas.

The history of the interpretation of v. 9, 10, is of peculiar interest. This might naturally be expected on an attentive consideration of the contents of the prophecy. The more pointedly, when rightly understood, it contradicts, as well the Jewish as the Rationalist conceptions of the Messiah, the more clearly must the doctrinal prejudice of the enemies of revelation manifest itself in the history of its interpretation. This history must, therefore, possess not merely a literary, but a no less psychological interest, and at the same time give an indirect testimony for the truth, whose defenders need not the art of its opposers, but may simply declare what appears on the right application of the proper aids to be the sense of each particular passage.

Among the Jews, as far back as history extends, the Messianic interpretation was the prevailing one. This is proved by the numerous passages from the Talmud, and other old Jewish writings collected among others by Bochart, *Hieroz.* p. 214, Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetstein on Matth. chap. 21. The groundless suspicion of Paulus (Comment. z. N. T. 3, p. 113), that this may have been introduced after the time of Christ, is refuted by the remark, that the later prevalence of the Messianic interpretation of a passage, which so directly contradicted the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah, and furnished the Christian polemic with so powerful a weapon, can be explained only by the supposition, that it was sanctioned by tradition derived from the highest antiquity. To this we must add, that the close relation of the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem to this passage, imperatively requires us to suppose, that in his time it was referred to the Messiah. For otherwise it is scarcely conceivable what could have been the object in making the symbolic action in its minutest circumstances refer to the prophecy. Theodoret, indeed, asserts, that the Jews of his time explained the prophecy of Zerubbabel, (*Ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὴν ἐμβροντησίαν θαυμάζω, εἰς τὸν Ζοροβάβελ ταύτην λίαν ἀναισχύντως ἐκλαμβάνειν τολμώντων.*) But, as there is not the slightest trace of such an interpretation in the Jewish writings themselves, and as no one of the later non-Messianic interpreters ever hit upon Zerubbabel, who seems always to have been considered as entirely excluded by the future יָבֹא, it is highly probable that Theodoret had no historical knowledge of such an interpretation, but conjectured its existence only from the analogy of other prophecies.

The prophecy, however, when referred to the Messiah and correctly explained, must have caused the Jews great inconvenience. Independently of the fulfilment, it was not easy to reconcile this passage, merely in itself considered, with others in which the Messiah is represented in glory, nor even the predicate, "poor and riding on an ass," in this prophecy itself, with the others contained in it. The history of the Redeemer alone completely removes this difficulty. "*Sa personne sacrée,*" remarks Calmet, "*nous fournit tout à la fois ce qu'il y a de plus grand, de plus divin, de plus magnifique, de plus fort, allié sans confusion et sans contradiction avec ce qu'il y a de plus humble, de plus doux, de plus pauvre, de plus affligé, de plus foible. Il n'y a que la religion Chrétienne, qui sache concilier des extremitez, qui paroissent si contraires et si opposées.*" That this

difficulty very early perplexed the Jews, is shown by an attempt at explanation, which is found in the Talmud Sanhedrin, chap. 11 : "*Rabbi Josue filius Levi objecit: scriptum est de Messia, Dan.* 7 : 13. *Et ecce cum nubibus cœli sicut filius hominis venit. At Sach.* 9 : 9, *de eodem scriptum est, pauper et insidens asino. Resp. si Israelitæ digni sunt, veniet cum nubibus cœli, si non sunt digni, veniet pauper et asino insidens.*" In this explanation, not only is the Messianic interpretation retained, but the words are taken in their natural sense. Still this interpretation could scarcely be expected to meet with general acceptance in respect to this difficulty only. It would have been plausible only in case the Messianic passages had been so distinct, that the one contained merely the prediction of an obscure, the other merely that of a glorious Messiah. This is however by no means the case, as even the example of this passage sufficiently shows. He who is designated as "poor and riding on an ass," appears at the same time as king, as peculiarly favored of God, as ruler of the whole earth. For this reason the expedient of distinguishing between the Messiah Ben Joseph, and the Messiah Ben David, (Vol. I. p. 210,) whereby other passages which predicted a Messiah in lowliness were evaded, was here inapplicable, although, according to the testimony of Abenezra, it was not the less resorted to by some. There was still another reason, which exerted a more powerful influence than this difficulty. In consequence of the carnal nature of the Messianic hopes of the Jews, which was constantly becoming more striking by the contrast with Christianity, to most of them the thought was insupportable, that the Messiah should appear even conditionally in humiliation. Under these circumstances there remained for them only two alternatives. They must either reject the reference to the Messiah, or seek to remove the stumblingblock by interpretation. "*Feris enim similes sunt*," remarks Hulsius, *Theol. Jud.* p. 162, "*isti homines, qui venatorum retia devitant, quantum possunt, ubi vero se irretitas senserint, conantur eluctari.*" It was natural, that comparatively few should take the former course; the Messianic interpretation had the authority of tradition in its favor, and was at the same time sanctioned by the Talmud. While צַדִּיק and נוֹשָׁע, in v. 9, and the whole contents of the tenth verse presented such pleasing prospects, that many could with difficulty prevail upon themselves to regard the prophecy as having been already fulfilled. There was, moreover, the difficulty of making the non-Messianic interpretation har-

monize with the time in which Zechariah lived. In the case of the prophets who lived before the exile, there were subjects, as Hezekiah for example, to which the Messianic prophecies which occasioned perplexity, might, though not without violence, be referred. Zechariah, however, prophesied during the second temple, when the kingdom had long been extinct; among the leaders of the Jews in this later period, there was no one to whom the contents of the tenth verse could be plausibly referred, even by the aid of a forced interpretation, and the assumption of a grotesque hyperbole. Nevertheless there were at least two interpreters who ventured to bid defiance to these hindrances, because they appeared to them still less than the intolerable, "poor and riding on an ass," which not only threatened to destroy their whole theology, but was also revolting to their *hearts*, while the non-Messianic interpretation only violated their understanding, and their sense of exegetical propriety. Rabbi Moses Hakkohen, according to Abenezra, referred the prophecy to Nehemiah. He is called, Neh. 6:6, 7, "King of Judah"; he was poor and rode upon an ass, because he possessed no horse. Abenezra refuted him by the remark, that, in the cited passage, the title of king was attributed to him only in the way of reproach by his enemies; he never wished himself to be any other than a Persian stadtholder. To his great riches, history bears testimony. Abenezra himself, however, just as widely errs. "*Mea sententia*," he says, "*Juda filius Chasmonæi regis nomine intelligitur, qui fortis fuit. Atque initio neque dives erat, neque equo instructus.*" Bochart l. c. has given himself much trouble ingeniously and learnedly to refute this explanation. The best refutation, however, is found in Abarbanel: "*Demiror, malam intentionem oculos intellectus ejus ita excæcasse.*"

Far more numerous, on the contrary, were those, who, retaining the Messianic interpretation, sought to remove the grounds of offence by exegesis, and cover as well as they could the supposed nakedness of the Messiah. (Athanasius makes the heathen say in mockery: *Ὁ θεὸς τῶν Χριστιανῶν, καλούμενος Χριστὸς, εἰς ὀνάριον ἐκάθισε.* According to Tertullian, the Christians were called by the Romans, *asinarii;* comp. also the ridicule of King Sapor mentioned on p. 98.) The latter was sought to be accomplished in a ridiculous manner by those, who asserted, that the ass upon which the Messiah will ride, is a son of the she ass, which had been made within the six days of creation, and the same on which Abraham rode, when he went to

offer up Isaac, and Moses when he went down into Egypt; comp. the *Jalkut Rubeni* in Schöttgen l. c. and other passages from the *Jalkut Schimeoni*, the *Pirke R. Elieser* and *Jarchi* in Eisenmenger II. p. 697, whose ridicule of the obstinacy of this ass, will not indeed be found entirely just by him, who remembers the Jewish doctrine of the migration of souls, which lies at the foundation of this fable. The R. Samuel in the Tract *Sanhedrin* l. c. refutes the ridicule of King Sapor by the remark, that the ass of the Messiah will have a hundred colors! Those proceed more ingeniously, who, as the Seventy and the Chald. Paraphrast, take עָנִי as a designation of humility, and the riding on the ass as its sign. So R. Saadias Haggaon on Dan. 7:13: הלא יבא בענוא כי לא יבא על סוסים בגאות, "He will come in humility, not on horses in pride." So Kimchi, Jarchi, (who betrays his evil conscience by skipping over עָנִי as quick as possible, with the hasty remark, this כוזת ענוה is a sign of humility,) Abarbanel, and others.

It is self-evident, that the reference of the prophecy to the historical Christ exclusively prevailed in the Christian church, until the rise of Deism and Rationalism. The only exception was made by Grotius, whose assertion, that the prophecy referred only in a higher sense to Christ, but properly and directly to Zerubbabel, excited general opposition, and called forth a multitude of refutations. The first of these was that of Bochart, who left indeed no great gleanings for his successors. Here also the *mala intentio* was very manifest, (see on the causes of his errors in the interpretation of the Messianic prophecies, Vol. I. p. 261;) his very hesitation (he supposes on Matth. 21, the passage could be referred also to Judas Macc., or some other person,) shows, that he aimed to set aside at any price the reference to the Messiah, against which he does not bring a single argument. But still more clearly does this appear from the violent operations, which he, an interpreter of fine exegetical tact, employs for this purpose. He explains יָבֹא by "he *has* come," and refers it to the return of Zerubbabel from Babylon, which happened long before the time of the prophecy. He affirms, in opposition to the testimony of history, that Zerubbabel, if not in name, yet in reality, was a king, and slily appeals to Jer. 23:5; Ez. 37:22, 24, as passages where he is called king, in like manner as here, without even intimating that such is the case only according to his own παρερμηνεία, arising from the same *mala intentio;* צַדִּיק, he dilutes by the explanation, *i. e. æquus, φιλόπατρις, non tyrannus.* The perversion

of "poor" and "riding on an ass," as being self-evident, and moreover furnished him by the Jewish interpreters, scarcely requires mentioning. Against the latter Bochart remarks: "*Frigidum id est inprimis, quod his prophetæ verbis: Et ascendens etc. significari vult Zorobabelis modestiam et pacis studium. Sic enim etiam Solomon cum toto equitatu suo dici potuerit asino esse vectus, quia rex nullus pacis fuit studiosior.*" But still greater sacrifices of exegetical feeling were required by v. 10; for scarcely can a stronger contrast be conceived than that between the poor Zerubbabel, and the king of this verse. The removal of the war-chariots, &c., from Ephraim, signifies, according to him, that all hostile power shall be made harmless, (comp. p. 100.) That "he will speak peace to the heathen," he explains: "*nempe civitas Jerusalem fœdera faciet cum regibus, cum Lacedæmoniis, cum Romanis.*" The history of Zerubbabel left him here entirely in the lurch, but, rather than give up his hypothesis on that account, he resorts to a violation of grammar, and supplies as subject for יִרְבֶּה the *femin.* "Jerusalem." To this also he refers the *suff. mascul.* in מָשְׁלוֹ. How little he accomplished by this great effort appears from a comparison of, "from sea to sea, from the Euphrates to the bounds of the earth," with his explanation: "*imperium Hierosolymorum, sub quod venit Samaria, Galilæa, Galaaditis et alia, quæ a temporibus Jeroboami distracta fuerant!*"

The history of the interpretation of this prophecy by the Rationalists presents much which corresponds with that by the Jews. They also could by no means perceive in it the Messiah in poverty and lowliness. They would thus have annihilated their whole system, which rests on the exclusion of every supernatural operation of God. Consequently they regarded the idea of the Messiah as a mere human invention. But, before they could carry through this assertion with any plausibility, they must set aside every thing that pointed to the lowliness, suffering, and death of the Messiah. For it was the expectation of a Messiah in glory only, that could be plausibly derived from the constitution of human nature, and the relations of the Israelitish people; they did not themselves pretend to explain the origin of the idea of a suffering Messiah, (comp. I. 268.) They were the more careful not to concede, that it was found in the Old Testament, since the agreement of such passages with the personal history of Christ was far more striking than that of the Messiah in glory. That which corresponds to the latter has, in part, yet to be fulfilled, and, even so far as it has been already

accomplished, remains in a great measure concealed from the eye of sense, and is obvious only to the eye of faith. With their views, therefore, they were *compelled* to pursue one of two ways, which the Jews had already taken before them.

Those who sought for another subject than the Messiah, were here somewhat more numerous than among the Jews. Bauer led the way in his work on the Minor Prophets. He referred the prophecy to Simon Maccabæus, who, alas, was only not a king, and, from beginning to end, was a warrior. At a later period (in the *Scholia in V. T.*) he saw himself the absurdity of his interpretation, and betook himself to the ideal Messiah. Paulus, (on Matth. 21,) who, for a mere doctrinal reason, maintains that the portion was composed in the time of the Maccabees, endeavoured by violent means to compel the prophecy to refer to the warlike John Hyrcanus; a reference which Jahn gave himself the trouble earnestly and fundamentally to refute, (*Vaticin. Mess.* I. p. 171 sqq.). These two interpreters belong to a period, in which Rationalism, not having yet thoroughly learnt to orientalize, was cautious on the subject of the ideal Messiah. The second expedient, at a later period, was generally preferred; only two recent interpreters adhered to the old method of interpretation. According to Forberg (*Comment. in Sach. Part. Post. Part.* 1, p. 24,) the subject of the prophecy was King Uzziah, who vanquished the Philistines. Here also the *mala intentio* becomes very evident from his entirely omitting עָנִי in the translation, and thus proving that he was not himself convinced of the correctness of his explanation. Theiner makes even Jehovah the subject; he thought that Jehovah, who has gradually conquered all enemies, and who will conquer any, who may hereafter arise, is figuratively expressed by the prophet by the fiction of his solemn entry into Jerusalem. The erroneous interpretation of "poor," and "riding on an ass," has here reached its climax, and it will not repay the trouble to show how נוֹשֵׁעַ also is explained in a manner entirely capricious, &c.

The number of those, who refer the prophecy to the ideal Messiah is very great. So Eckermann, (Beitr. I. 1, p. 99 sqq.) Kuinöl, Ammon, Eichhorn, Gesenius, Winer, and many others. Common to them all is the misunderstanding of עָנִי, and the "riding on an ass." In respect to most of them, to this must be added the limitation of "from sea to sea," &c., to the narrow bounds of Palestine, and the erroneous interpretation of נוֹשֵׁעַ by *conqueror*, proceeding on the

supposition, that, if not taken in this sense, it must necessarily mean *delivered*, and imply previous suffering, which does not suit the preconceived idea of the Messiah.

It is now incumbent upon us to prove the reference of the prophecy to the historical Christ, to be necessary, and the only one that is correct. All the arguments are here combined, by which, in general, the Messianic character of a passage can be proved, (comp. Vol. I. 245.)

1. The evidence of the New Testament is here of especial importance, and indeed, eminently, that of the Lord himself. The older theologians, for the most part, regarded the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem on an ass, as an irrefragable internal argument for the reference of the prophecy to him. As such, Chrysostom of old triumphantly exhibited it to the Jews: *Ἐρώτησον τοίνυν τὸν Ἰουδαῖον, ποῖος βασιλεὺς ὀχούμενος ἐπὶ ὄνου ἦλθεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιεν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ τοῦτον μόνον.* It must, however, be confessed, that, understood in this way, it could make an impression only on opposers, who were favorably disposed. The English deists, (*Biblioth. Britann.* 1, p. 403 sqq.) and among the recent critics, Ammon, objected, that this action could prove nothing, since it was voluntary, and one which might be performed also by a false Messiah. In addition to this, there is another argument. The importance attached to the entrance of Christ on an ass, as an internal argument for the fulfilment of the prophecy in him rested on the supposition, that Zechariah properly and literally described such an event. This supposition, however, is erroneous, though it was perceived by scarcely any of the older interpreters, except Calvin and Vitringa, (*Comm. in Jes.* II. p. 667.) The "riding on an ass" is, in the first instance, only an individualizing of עָנִי, only an exhibition of the lowliness of the exalted king by a striking image. Vitringa, therefore, justly remarks, that the prophecy would be fulfilled in Christ, even though he had not in this manner made his entrance into Jerusalem. Accordingly the absence of this sign could not be made an objection to another subject, if it could be shown that he possessed, in connexion with the other marks, only the substance of the figure, the entire lowliness which it implies. — In another point of view, however, the entrance of Christ is of great importance, as a proof of the Messianic character of the passage. It supplies the place of an interpretation expressed in the most emphatic words. The entrance of Christ was a symbolic action, whose object and import

were to establish his regal dignity, and at the same time to exhibit by a lively image the true nature of his person and his kingdom, in contrast with the false conceptions of his friends and his enemies. The entrance, therefore, had its import independent of the prophecy; nor indeed did any action of Christ, or any event of his life, occur without such an import, and solely for the fulfilment of prophecy, which, to be sure, in very many instances, was a concurrent object, (comp. Vol. I. 328.) Without this independent import of the transaction, it is scarcely to be explained, why Mark and Luke did not expressly intimate its reference to the prophecy. But that Christ selected precisely this from among many possible modes of symbolic representation, that, in ordering the particular circumstances of his entrance, he had the prophecy in view, (comp. p. 98,) can be explained only by the supposition, that as, especially in respect to the last actions and events of his life, he so repeatedly and emphatically exhibits the reference to the prophecies of the Old Testament, so did he intend by this explanation to represent himself as the king promised by Zechariah. The objection, that this explanation of his, has of itself no weight, as a testimony, is met by the wonderful deeds which preceded the transactions, and the wonderful circumstances which were connected with it. — After the testimony of the Lord himself, for the reference of the prophecy to him, has been shown, it is scarcely necessary to dwell on that of the apostles. For the believer, the former is sufficient; he who does not believe the Lord, will pay still less regard to his servants. In respect to Matthew, Fritzsche has already shown, that the close relation in which he places the entrance of Christ to the prophecy as well appears from τότε, in v. 1, (*quum appropinquasset Hierosolymis*, tunc *memor* oraculi *misit*,) as it also follows from v. 4. The form of citation in this verse, Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ, is the most emphatic of all, (comp. Vol. I. p. 328.) The reference to the prophecy is so important in the view of John, that he adduces it as something entirely peculiar, that the disciples attained to the knowledge of it after the glorification of Christ.

2. As an external accessory proof, the testimony of Jewish tradition also is valid, (comp. p. 105.) The author takes this opportunity to remark, that he has never attributed to this proof any other than a subordinate importance, and has always been far from supposing, that it is alone sufficient to establish the Messianic character of a passage. No one can be willing to assert this, who, from an

intimate acquaintance with the older Jewish interpretations, knows what a mass of passages are, without any reason, referred to the Messiah, even in them. An auxiliary argument, though not of itself decisive, may be derived from tradition, when, as in the present instance, the tradition can be shown to be both very ancient and unanimous, and when there is nothing in the passage to favor the carnal Messianic hopes of the Jews, and thus furnish an inducement for the Messianic interpretation.

3. This interpretation can be justified also from parallel passages, v. 10. The words, "from sea to sea," &c., are taken from Ps. 72, already shown to be Messianic; the remaining part of the verse refers back to the passage, Mic. 5: 9, which is likewise Messianic, (comp. Beitr. 1, p. 368.)

4. But the contents of the prophecy itself furnish the chief argument after the authority of Christ and his apostles, and one which is in itself entirely decisive. The remarks contained in it of the king are of a kind, which suit no other subject than the historical Christ. Every subject found in the later Jewish history is excluded by his very designation as the king of the covenant people, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, still more, however, by the enigmatical union of apparently the most opposite marks, the deepest abasement and helplessness, and at the same time a dominion, which, not by the power of arms, but the bare word of the king, extends itself over the whole earth, and brings all the heathen nations into a state of peace and obedience. Theodoret: *καὶ τὸ πάντων παραδοξότατον, ὅτι τοῦ κλῖναι τὴν κεφαλὴν οὐκ ἔχων, ὁ τῷ πώλῳ χρησάμενος πάσης γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἐθελήσας ἐκράτησε.* That the reference to the ideal Messiah is untenable, its defenders themselves involuntarily testify, by their forced interpretations.

Arguments against the Messianic interpretation to be refuted, we do not find, unless one were to regard as such the trivial objection of R. Lipmann, that the dominion of Christ does not extend over the whole earth, and many wars have been waged since his appearance. The answer has already been given, (Vol. I. 297.) It is still to be remarked, that several fathers, as Theodoret and Eusebius, were led to refer this passage also, like Is. 2, to the peace, which prevailed under the reign of Augustus. By such weak interpretations, arising from an extravagant dread of every thing which could afford the least support to the doctrine of the Chiliasts, they must have strengthened opposers in their error.

Chap. 9 : 11. — 10 : 12.

That a new portion here commences, or rather that a new scene presents itself to the spiritual eye of the prophet, is so clear from the contents, that it is scarcely conceivable how it could be overlooked by ancient and modern interpreters. The prophet, v. 9, 10, had described a kingdom of peace, which, deprived of all earthly weapons and bulwarks, should be extended over the whole earth, and embrace all the heathen nations. Here on a sudden all is warlike. The covenant people appear in conflict with their mighty oppressors, and as such the Greeks are particularly mentioned. The victory obtained by the aid of the Lord is followed, in connexion with other Theocratic blessings, by that freedom, of which the covenant people under Zechariah were still painfully destitute. And, in order to make the prosperity complete, Ephraim also, who, at the time of the prophet, appeared, according to human view, to be a branch for ever separated from the vine, is at last led back by the Lord from his dispersion, and again incorporated with the Theocracy.

It is evident from this representation, that the prophecy, with the exception of the last prediction, which reaches to the time of the Messiah, refers not merely in the first instance, but exclusively to the time of the Maccabees. What the Lord would then do to complete the work begun among the covenant people by the restoration from the Babylonish exile, the prophet represents to his contemporaries, who are mourning over the feeble beginnings of the new colony.

This sudden transition from the time of the Messiah to that which preceded it, need not appear strange. The prophet had spoken, v. 1 – 8, of the expedition of Alexander, and of the protection of the covenant people during its progress. The transition from this point to the times of the Maccabees, would have been altogether more in accordance with the actual succession of events. But in the period between the two events his spiritual eye had fallen upon the far greater blessings, which should be conferred upon the covenant people by the Messiah. This we cannot explain, with Jahn, by supposing a contrast of the great Prince of Peace with the great worldly conqueror described, v. 1 – 8. Had this been the design of the prophet, the person of the latter in v. 1 – 8, would not have been kept so much in the back ground. It was rather owing to the fact, that the Messianic hopes so entirely fill the soul of the prophets, that

they pass over from every inferior blessing to this last and highest, to which all others refer, unconcerned whether in the mean time other blessings of God still await the covenant people, in the representation of which, in a manner equally easy and unobserved, they again return to the Messianic time, the images of which everywhere force themselves upon them with an irresistible charm, and sometimes even mingle with those of the nearer benefits, (comp. Vol. I. p. 226.)

V. 11. "*Even thou, — on account of thy covenant sealed with blood, I release thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water.*" גַּם־אַתְּ, according to most interpreters, (Mark, Michaelis, Pfeifer, Rosenmüller and others,) stands in contrast with the blessings announced in the preceding context to the heathen nations: "Believe not, O Zion, that the Lord will therefore neglect thee; he will rather cherish for thee an entirely peculiar care." But this supposition is untenable, because the promises in the two foregoing verses directly refer only to the covenant people, and only so far to the heathen, as the predicted extension of the Theocracy over them was also a benefit to the covenant people. It is *Zion's* king whose dominion extends itself over the whole earth, and in his glory his people also participate. Equally inadmissible is the explanation of Cocceius and others, "*Non solum venit rex tuus, sed et dimisi vinctos tuos.*" For it renders the *pron. separatum* אַתְּ, which must necessarily have a peculiar emphasis, entirely useless, and the גַּם connected with it by Makkeph, is referred directly to שִׁלַּחְתִּי. The correct interpretation is, that גַּם־אַתְּ "also thou," stands for "even thou," exactly as v. 12, גַּם־הַיּוֹם, "even to day," i. q. although thou art in a state of total helplessness, although thou appearest to be lost beyond deliverance. This, so far as we are informed, is peculiar to Calvin: "*Particula* גַּם *emphatica est, quasi diceret: Video me non multum proficere apud vos, quia estis quodammodo attoniti malis; deinde nulla spes vos recreat, quoniam putatis, vos esse quasi centum mortibus obrutos. Ergo utcunque hæc congeries malorum vos exanimet, — tamen redimam vinctos vestros. . . . . Nam tunc poterat occurrere hæc dubitatio: Quid iste nos ad ingentem lætitiam hortatur, cum tamen partim adhuc captiva sit ecclesia dei, partim autem misere et crudeliter ab hostibus suis vexentur, qui reversi sunt in patriam. Huic objectioni in dei persona respondet propheta, quod scilicet deus ad suos liberandos sufficiet, etiamsi demersi sint in profundissimo gurgite.*" בְּדַם־בְּרִיתֵךְ, "in the blood of thy covenant," is by several

interpreters referred to שִׁלַּחְתִּי. It would not then be necessary to attribute an unauthorized meaning to בְּ. The action of deliverance would be represented as resting in the blood of the covenant, or depending upon it. But this connexion is contrary to the accents which bind the words closely with גַּם־אַתְּ, and separate them from שִׁלַּחְתִּי: "also thou, in the blood of thy covenant I dismiss," &c., i. q. "however miserable thou mayst be, nevertheless, because thou art in the blood of the covenant, thou art thereby freed from sin, and consecrated to me," &c. After the conclusion of the covenant on Sinai, Moses had sprinkled the people with the blood of the victims, saying: "Behold that is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord makes with you concerning all these words." Exod. 24: 8. — By this symbolical act, — the blood a sign and means of deliverance from sin, Levit. 17: 11; Heb. 9: 18 sq., — were the people solemnly declared as purified, consecrated to the Lord, and, therefore, at the same time also under his peculiar protection, a declaration, which was constantly repeated by the sacrificial institutions ordained by God. The blood of the covenant was accordingly a sure pledge to the covenant people of deliverance from every distress, so long as they did not make its promises of none effect by a wicked violation of the conditions, which God had imposed. Calvin: "*Si sacrificia vestra neque frustra instituit deus, neque etiam frustra vos servatis, certe effectus tandem in lucem prodibit. — Vos quotidie offertis victimas et sanguis funditur in altari; hoc deus noluit frustra fieri. Jam cum ideo vos recipiat deus in gratiam, ut salvi sitis: liberabit ergo vinctos ecclesiæ suæ.*" שִׁלַּחְתִּי is taken by several interpreters, as Jarchi, Kimchi, Drusius, Grotius, Blayney, Rosenmüller, and others, as a proper *præter:* "As I formerly brought back thy captives from Egypt, so (v. 12) also shall ye now return to your native land." Tarnov: "*Non est, quod de complemento præcedentium* (others: *sequentium*) *promissionum quicquam dubites: respice saltem recens tibi præstitum beneficium, quo ex Babylone es educta, id quod tibi, quando promittebatur per prophetas ejus, ἐκ τῶν ἀδυνάτων esse videbatur.*" But there is no doubt, that שִׁלַּחְתִּי is the *præteritum propheticum*, and that the prophet speaks of a future deliverance of the covenant people. On the opposite supposition the discourse is too abrupt, and requires something to be supplied. The expression, "return to the stronghold," v. 12, which, as will hereafter appear, relates "to the pit in which there is no water," shows, that we are not here to look for a designation of an

affliction which has long since passed; and besides the reference to the oppression in Egypt, and in general to any calamity which had already taken place, is irreconcilable with the correct interpretation of the first words of the verse. In what follows also, and which is generally acknowledged to relate to the future, the *præter* is constantly interchanged with the *future*, comp. e. g. v. 13. — Empty cisterns were used in the East instead of prisons; hence the latter, even when they were not cisterns, received the name בּוֹר. In consequence of the mud remaining in them, they were exceedingly unwholesome and noxious. אֵין מַיִם בּוֹ is taken by several, as Calvin, as a designation of a second distress, not necessarily connected with confinement in the cistern : " *Deinde siti etiam arescere, ita ut sponte illis immineat mors, nisi liberentur mirabiliter a deo.*" But this addition, which, so far as the language is concerned, alludes to Gen. 38 : 24, וְהַבּוֹר רֵיק אֵין בּוֹ מָיִם, serves rather for a more accurate description of the בּוֹר itself. It was only into cisterns without water, that prisoners were thrown. Mark, therefore, is likewise in error when he perceives herein an allusion to a quality of the pit itself, which would make it insupportable : " *Cum foveæ negantur aquæ, possit in ea indirecte videri positum lutum profundum, fœdum et fœtidum.*" Ps. 40 : 3; Jer. 38 : 6. — Many interpreters suppose the abiding in the pit, to be a figurative designation of imprisonment; so Grotius, Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, Forberg. But this supposition has no justification in the figure itself. It rather occurs elsewhere also in a wider sense, as a designation of the deepest distress and misery. Thus e. g. Ps. 40 : 3, 88 : 7; Lam. 3 : 53, where the reference to a special event in the life of Jeremiah is evidently erroneous. Also Is. 42 : 22, the image of a prison stands for a designation of the deepest misery. That this wider meaning, however, prevails in this passage appears from the following grounds. 1. As the *stronghold* in v. 12, is an image of prosperity and security, so must its contrast also, the *pit*, be an image of misfortune and helplessness. We find entirely the same antithesis, Ps. 40 : 3. "He brought me up also out of a horrible *pit*, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a *rock*." 2. The way in which the covenant people, according to v. 13, shall be delivered from their distress by a brave effort, favored by the Lord, shows, that it is not a carrying away into exile, connected with a deprivation of all the means of defence, which is intended. Finally, it must still be added, that the supposition of a captivity in a strange land, being here the subject

of discourse, presupposes one of two erroneous hypotheses, viz. either the reference of v. 11, to something past, or the spuriousness of the second part. — We now examine more closely what distress and what misery here presented themselves to the spiritual eye of the prophet. The Greek and Latin fathers, likewise the later Christian interpreters, (comp. the collections by Mark, and those still more complete by Münden, *Dissert. ad h. l.* Helmstädt) almost unanimously refer the passage to the spiritual distress and misery, from which the Messiah should deliver. But this is plainly erroneous. The distress in this verse is the same from which, v. 12, deliverance is promised; and from the more accurate description of this deliverance, in v. 13, it appears, that it should consist in a victorious conflict against the Greeks. According to this close connexion of v. 11 – 13, which is undeniable, the distress can be no other than the oppression experienced from Alexander's successors in the kingdom of Syria. This is so very obvious, that it surely would not have been overlooked, if critics had not been led astray by the supposition, founded on ignorance of the prophetic vision, that it would be unnatural for the prophet to make a sudden transition from the Messianic time to an earlier period, from the highest deliverance to an inferior one. The greater portion of them were so blinded by this supposition, that they explained the whole portion allegorically; others, as Theodoret and Mark, feeling how unnatural this would be, suppose that the portion from v. 13 referred directly to the times of the Maccabees; certainly with less consistency than the rest, as Cyril, Cocceius, Ch. B. Michaelis; since v. 13 sq. cannot possibly refer to any other subject than the two foregoing, with which they are most closely connected by כִּי.

V. 12. "*Return to the stronghold ye prisoners of hope. To-day I still declare; The double will I return to you.*" "Turn back to the stronghold," has been the subject of many false interpretations. One of the most common is that, according to which Zion or Jerusalem is understood by the stronghold, and the prophet exhorts those, who still remain in exile, to return to their native land. The difficulty that Jerusalem was an open place in the time of Zechariah, and was not fortified again until a later period, by Nehemiah, they endeavoured to remove in various ways. Calvin supposes Jerusalem to be called a stronghold, because the protection of the Lord surrounds it as a wall of fire: "*Etsi enim Judæa tunc non adeo munita erat, imo neque ipsa Hierosolyma altos muros vel*

validas turres haberet, erat tamen dei munitio, et quidem inexpugnabilis. — Zacharias in illa rerum omnium penuria docet esse satis præsidii in uno deo." Jahn finds an intimation of the future fortification of Jerusalem; others, as Mark and Grotius, an exhortation to return to God, as the true bulwark of those who flee to him for refuge. Others finally, as Rosenmüller, after the Chaldee paraphrast, explain: "*Revertimini, ut fiatis, h. e. iterum fiatis civitates munitæ;*" against which Mark justly observes, that לְ connected with שׁוּב could naturally point out, as it does everywhere else, only the *terminus motus ad quem.* All these interpretations have arisen from mistaking the very obvious contrast of the *stronghold* and the *pit*, an attention to which shows at once that בְּצָרוֹן, *locus inaccessus, munitus*, in like manner as the rock, the high place, &c., in numerous passages, is only an image of security and prosperity. The *imper.* שׁוּבוּ stands for *fut.*, to express the thought, that the return depends on nothing else but the will of the covenant people, just as chap. 10 : 1, "*ask* of the Lord rain," i. e. ye need only *ask* rain. — By the address, "prisoners of hope," the prophet calls the attention of his people to the covenant and the promises, which, even in the deepest misery, afforded them a pledge of their future deliverance. — גַּם־הַיּוֹם has been correctly understood by Michaelis alone of all the older interpreters: "*Loquitur hic deus, non quasi eminus futura commonstrans, sed quasi diem, qui futurus erat, præsentem jam stitisset.*" The prophet is transferred in the spirit to the time when the oppression of the covenant people has reached its summit, and thence beholds its approaching end. Without this supposition, sufficiently grounded in a correct view of the nature of prophecy, it is inconceivable how a stress so entirely peculiar can be laid by the subjoined גַּם, on *to-day.* Moreover, this transition to the time of the oppression, some hundred years distant, is placed beyond a doubt by the preceding address: "Return to the stronghold, *ye prisoners of hope.*" — "I will render back to thee double," viz. of the prosperity which thou formerly possessed; parallel passages, which Zechariah probably had in view, are Is. 40 : 2, "That she receives of the Lord *double,* כִּפְלַיִם, for all the punishments of her sins;" 61 : 7, "Instead of your shame will I give you double, מִשְׁנֶה; instead of reproach, they shall rejoice over their inheritance; in their land they shall possess double; everlasting joy shall be to them."

V. 13. "*For I bend to me Judah, fill the bow with Ephraim, and raise up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Javan, and make*

thee like the sword of a hero." The prophet here more particularly described the distress, and the way in which the deliverance from it, predicted in general in the preceding verse, should take place. By the help of the Lord, (Calvin: "*Quid arcus per se poterit, nisi tendatur? Deinde nisi excutiantur sagittæ, arcus ipse jacebit,*") they shall obtain, notwithstanding their own weakness, splendid victories over their powerful oppressors, the Greeks. By a bold figure the prophet represents Judah, as the bow bent by the Lord, Ephraim, as the arrow shot by him, to express the thought, that Judah and Ephraim would both take a part in the glorious struggle, and perhaps also intimates a certain subordination of Ephraim to Judah. A figure somewhat similar has been adduced by Jahn, from Abulfeda, (*Annal. Moslem. t. III.* p. 474.) The host appears there as the bow, the leader as the arrow shot from the same. According to the accents, קֶשֶׁת does not belong to the foregoing, but the following words. It is unnecessary to depart from their authority; nay the connexion with what precedes, assumed by many interpreters, is even untenable. For מִלֵּאתִי then loses one of its two objects, and must necessarily have a *suff.* referring to קֶשֶׁת. — The only correct interpretation of the words קֶשֶׁת מִלֵּאתִי אֶפְרַיִם is: "I fill the bow with Ephraim." Mark unjustly objects that the arrow does not fill the bow, ("*Implere aliquid aliqua re de collectione et copia dicitur, arcui vero singula ad singulos jactus imponuntur spicula,*") an objection which Drusius, though in an unsatisfactory manner, sought to obviate by the remark: "*Impleri arcus intelligitur, cum sagittæ crebræ per eum emittuntur.*" As only one arrow can be shot with the bow, it is full as soon as this is applied. Abundant examples are found in Syriac, a *full* bow, for one furnished with an arrow, Is. 21: 15, and "to fill the bow," for to supply it with an arrow, Ps. 11: 2, as a free, though not, as J. D. Michaelis supposes, a verbal translation of the Hebr. דָּרַךְ קֶשֶׁת and קֶשֶׁת דָּרוּכָה. Among the remaining interpretations, many of which are exceedingly arbitrary, that of Jerome deserves notice: "*Quasi arcum implevi Ephraim,*" among the moderns defended by Michaelis (*Supplem.* p. 1504), according to which Ephraim, as well as Judah, is represented under the image of a bow in the hand of the Lord. But it is liable to the objection, that the omission of the one object, although this in itself is not untenable, must yet not be assumed without necessity; besides the unsuitableness of attributing a double bow to the same archer, and the more so, since the last

comparison of Zion with a sword renders the mention of different kinds of arms probable. Another false interpretation, as it is found, among others, in Jarchi, "*Arcu implebo manum Ephraimi*," with a comparison of 2 Kings 9 : 24, is objectionable, not only on account of the collocation of the words, which plainly should give prominence to קֶשֶׁת, as the first object, but also the feebleness of the sense, in contrast with the first member, where Judah himself appears as the bow in the hand of the Lord. — "*I awake thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Javan.*" These words have involved those, who introduce false hypotheses for the interpretation of this portion, in no small embarrassment. The older interpreters, who explained the whole portion allegorically, assume, that the Greeks stand here by Synecdoche for all heathen nations, who should be constrained by the Gospel. This supposition, however, is entirely groundless, even if we leave out of view, that the spiritual interpretation of the whole portion is altogether arbitrary. It is indeed true, that a *species* is not seldom rendered prominent by the prophets, where they intend the whole *genus;* but then there must be a ground for this individualization. Thus, e. g., no people can stand for all the enemies of the Theocracy, which has not either before, or at the time of the prophet, sustained towards it a hostile relation, or become already in his time an object of peculiar terror. The necessity of such a ground the older interpreters seem also to have felt in the present instance. But the one which they have given is exceedingly strange : "*Per Græcos significat omnes gentiles, orta nimirum hac loquendi consuetudine ex eo, quod pleraque pars Orientis olim Græce loquebatur.*" So Drusius and several others, urging at the same time, that in the New Testament the heathen, under the name of Greeks, are opposed to the Jews. In this they intentionally forgot to distinguish the times of Zechariah from those of the New Testament. — The recent Rationalist interpreters were involved in still greater embarrassment by this passage. Their fundamental principle, that the prophets constantly prophesied only of what lay within the political horizon of their time, was here in danger of suffering a sensible shock. The difficulty increased, as soon as the prophecy was referred, as it was by several, to the time of Uzziah. Different expedients, alike arbitrary, were resorted to. Flügge asserted, that Javan plainly signified here the same as Damascus and Hamath, chap. 9 : 1, and endeavoured to show in an especial *excursus*, l. c. p. 86 sq., that the pure Hebrew writers have in gen-

eral never understood by Javan, the land of Greece. Forberg supposes the prediction of a war against the Greeks, even in the time of Isaiah, would not be strange, if we only comp. Amos. 1 : 9, 10 ; Joel 4 : 4 – 7. But we see not what these passages can prove, since they by no means speak of a war against the Greeks, which, under the circumstances of that period, is altogether inconceivable. The land of Greece is rather named only as one of the most distant lands, into which individual Israelites had been carried prisoners by the traffic in slaves, not through the fault of its inhabitants, but of the Tyrians, against whom alone on this account the divine punishment is threatened. Rosenmüller asserts, in order to maintain the position that the Greeks here stand in general, by metonymy, for the heathen enemies of the covenant people, in defiance of all history, that the Macedonians in the time of the prophet had risen to such power, that they filled all the inhabitants of western Asia with terror. Eichhorn (Hebr. Proph. III. p. 424) resorts to the most desperate means in order to place the composition of the prophecy in the period after Alexander the Great, when the Greeks were actually the most powerful nation in all hither Asia. But these forced expedients are unnecessary, so soon as we proceed without prejudice to the interpretation of the passage. The name *Javan*, to which the Homeric forms, *Jaon* and *Jaones*, as well as the Syriac, *Jaunoje*, approach the nearest, and which, for this very reason, we must not, with J. D. Michaelis, hastily change into *Jon*, designates the Greece of the Hebrews in a wider sense, as is evident from the fact, that Alexander, Dan. 8 : 21, is called king of the land of Greece. Numerous traces of an original wider import of the name, even among the Greeks themselves, have been pointed out by Bochart, *Phaleg*, III. 3, cap. 154. The prophet, now raised, indeed, by divine illumination above the horizon of his time, represents, in passing, the victory which the Jews under the Maccabees, by the aid of the Lord, should gain over the Grecian rulers of Syria, as it had already been fully predicted by Daniel. The nearer the prophetic order approached its termination, the more necessary it became that the holy seers, who still remained, should apprize, not only their contemporaries, but also their successors to the time of Christ, that the Lord had deposited for them, in the prophecies, a treasure of consolation and strength in their distresses, the exact prediction of which afforded them the proof, that they were not under the control of chance, but of their God, and at the same time the pledge, that the

predicted deliverance would no less surely come, (comp. the more full remarks on this subject in Beitr. I. p. 191 sq.) — This reference of the passage is so very obvious, that, as we have before remarked, even several defenders of the spiritual interpretation of the whole portion, and of the reference to the Messianic times, cannot refrain from regarding it at least as the lower sense, and the one first intended. Thus says Theodoret : *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν Μακεδόνων ὡς ἐν τύπῳ πέρας ἔσχε ἡ προφητεία· ὁρμήσαντα γὰρ τῆς Σιὼν τὰ τέκνα ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐτρέψαντό τε τὰς πολλὰς τῶν Μακεδόνων μυριάδας καὶ τρόπαιον ἐγείραντες ἐπανῆλθον νικηφόροι, καὶ τὸ καταλυθὲν θυσιαστήριον ἤγειραν.*

V. 14. "*And the Lord will appear over them; and his arrow goes forth as the lightning; and the Lord will blow with the trumpet; he moves in the storms of the south.*" The wonderful aid which God affords his people is represented under the image of that wherein his omnipotence is most strikingly exhibited in nature, viz. a thunderstorm, as, only far more fully, in Ps. 18, on which Calvin remarks : "*Summa huc redit, deum illum, qui omnes mundi partes, quoties ita visum est, concutit, ubi Davidi liberator adesse voluit, non minus aperte certisque indiciis apparuisse, quam si virtutem suam sursum et deorsum in omnibus creaturis exeruisset.*" The Lord draws near in the thunderstorm, the lightnings are his arrows, the thunder the trumpet wherewith he gives to his host the signal for the assault. The image is strictly carried through, except only that the arrows of God are *compared* with the lightning, not the lightnings, as in Ps. 18 : 15, ("He sent his arrows and scattered them, lightnings in abundance, and put them in confusion,") represented directly as the arrows of God. — Several interpreters take עָלֵיהֶם in the sense, "in their front," since they here find an allusion to the pillar of smoke and fire, which guided the Israelites through the wilderness, Exod. 13 : 21, 22, 14 : 19, 24. This explanation is not against usage, since עַל is employed of every thing that is higher than another. Comp. Ewald, p. 610. But the explanation *over them*, over their heads, is more agreeable to the figure of a thunderstorm. The Lord appears in the thunderstorm over his people, his host, and thence hurls the lightnings, his arrows, at the enemy. — Storms of the south occur also, Job 37 : 9 ; Is. 21 : 1, in the latter place in reference to Babylonia, as peculiarly violent, while elsewhere those from the east commonly appear as the most vehement. Comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* II. c. 102.

V. 15. "*The Lord of Hosts will protect them; they eat, tread under foot sling-stones, drink, make a tumult as from wine, become full as the sacrificial bowls, as the corners of the altar.*" Israel appears here, as Numb. 23 : 4, under the figure of a lion, "which does not lie down until he devours prey, and drinks the blood of the slain;" they eat not, indeed, as several interpret, the good things of the enemy, but their flesh, as plainly appears from the following word, *drink*, referring to the blood. Comp. chap. 12 : 6; Is. 49 : 26; "I make your oppressors eat your flesh, and they shall drink of your blood, as of must." The phrase וְכָבְשׁוּ אַבְנֵי־קֶלַע is explained by most interpreters, "they subdue by sling-stones." Thus of old, the Seventy: *Καὶ καταχώσουσι αὐτοὺς ἐν λίθοις σφενδόνης.* Jerome: "*Tanta erit ruina Græcorum, ut non dicam gladiis, sed jactu lapidum et fundarum rotatibus opprimantur.*" Likewise Mark, Michaelis, Theiner, Winer, and others. This interpretation is to be rejected even on account of its feebleness, so little suited to the dithyrambic elevation of the rest of the verse. The only true interpretation is, "they tread sling-stones under their feet," so that the enemies, in order to designate their weakness and contemptibleness, are themselves represented as sling-stones. The figure of the lion is then carried forward. That portion of the prey which he cannot devour, he proudly treads upon with his feet. This interpretation is favored, 1. by the parallelism. As in the second member every thing which follows שָׁתוּ relates to the blood, so here also must whatever follows אָכְלוּ be referred to the flesh. 2. The parallel passages. Entirely analogous is chap. 10 : 5, "They are as heroes trampling on the dirt of the streets;" where the enemy, just as they are here represented as sling-stones, appear as dirt of the streets, while they are only therewith compared by Micah, chap. 7 : 10, who is less bold. In another respect those passages are parallel, where, in the figure borrowed from wild animals, the eating and trampling under foot are connected with one another. Thus Mic. 5 : 7, "Israel will be among the nations as a lion among the beasts of the woods, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, who, passing through, at once tramples under foot and tears in pieces, while no one is able to deliver." Dan. 7 : 7, "It devoured and brake in pieces and stamped the residue with his feet." 3. The manifest antithesis between אַבְנֵי קֶלַע and אַבְנֵי נֵזֶר in the following verse. As there the Israelites appear under the image of the most precious stones, *crown*-stones, so must the meanest of all stones, sling-stones, here designate their

enemies. The verb בָּבַשׁ stands here accordingly in its original meaning, to *tread under*, which does not indeed occur elsewhere in Hebrew, (in Mic. 7: 19, where Winer assumes it, the usual meaning, to *subjugate*, is the more suitable: "*Peccatum concipitur immitis instar tyranni, cujus ferociam divina repressura sit gratia.*" Michael.) but its existence is evident from the derivative בֶּבֶשׁ, *quod pedibus subjicitur, scabellum*, and it also occurs in the Syriac. — הָמוּ, "they make a noise," signifies the drunkenness of the Israelites with victory and joy. — כְּמוֹ יַיִן is taken by several as in the *accus.* governed by שָׁתוּ. But more correctly others, "as wine," i. e. "as those who drink wine." This interpretation has in its favor the natural connexion with the verb immediately preceding, the suitableness of the concise expression, indicating a whole proposition by a single word, to the character of the whole verse; and lastly, in a very peculiar manner, the parallel passage, chap. 10: 7, "Their heart rejoices as wine," for "as though they had drunk wine." That in such cases we need not, as several have done here, supply a מִן requires now no farther proof. — In the phrase, "they become full as the sacrificial bowl," the article shows that we are not to understand by מִזְרָק every sacred bowl, but only those in which the blood, after all the veins of the victim had been opened, was received by the priests, and in part sprinkled upon the horns of the altar of burnt sacrifice, (comp. Lund, *jüd. Alterth.* p. 658.) The article refers back to מָלְאוּ, as the sacred bowl, sc. which is full of blood, comp. 14: 20. — "*As the corners of the altar.*" The blood was properly sprinkled, not against the corners, but the horns of the altar which were upon them. The prophet, however, here mentions the corners, because he considers the horns as belonging to them. Several, therefore, have been mistaken in concluding from this passage, that the horns of the altar were only its four corners, (comp. Lund, l. c. p. 199.)

V. 16. "*And the Lord grants them prosperity in this day, his people as a flock. For they shall be crown-stones raising themselves up on his land.*" הוֹשִׁיעַ does not here stand for mere rescue and deliverance, but moreover for the imparting of prosperity in general. This appears even from a comparison with that which the shepherd affords to the flock; still more, however, from the second part of the verse, where the particle כִּי indicates, that its contents must be already included in הוֹשִׁיעַ. After כְּצֹאן it is most natural to supply הוֹשִׁיעַ, "as a flock"; for, as a shepherd takes care of his flock, he

takes care of his people. Several, as Drusius and Michaelis, take צֹאן as standing with עַמּוֹ in *stat. const.* "as a flock of his people," *ut decet salvare gregem populi sui*, in comparison with צֹאן אָדָם, *oves hominum*, Ez. 36 : 37, 38. But this interpretation would be admissable only in case עַמּוֹ had no *suff.*; the *suff.* excludes every comparison, and the supposition of the *caph. veritatis*, by which it has been attempted here also to escape from the particle of comparison כְּ, is groundless, comp. Ewald, p. 614; Winer s. v. — The second part of the verse is very variously interpreted; the correct explanation is, "For in thy land they raise themselves up as crown-stones." Induced by the comparison of the enemies with sling-stones, the prophet represents the Israelites under the figure of costly precious stones, which set in high crowns, that stand in the holy land of the Lord, widely diffuse their radiance. This interpretation has in its favor, besides supplying the only suitable antithesis to the sling-stones in v. 15, that it only takes נָזַר in its established sense, and that כִּי, in v. 17, then stands completely in its place. For the image of the radiating precious stones already includes in itself all the glory of the Israelites, which, in v. 17 sq., is particularly recounted. הִתְנוֹסֵס not as a pure passive, but in the usual sense of *Hithpael*, in which it also occurs, Ps. 60 : 6. The *suff.* in אַדְמָתוֹ refers, as well as that in עַמּוֹ, to the Lord, not to the people, who had just been spoken of in the plural. That it is the land of the Lord in which the Israelites attain to this honor, constitutes at the same time its cause and the pledge of its continuance, and heightens their prosperity and their dignity. We now take a survey of the various interpretations. Some, as Mark, explain, "Boundary stones are raised on this land." On the contrary, נָזַר never occurs in the general sense *separatio*, which is indeed its original meaning, but only of a special kind of separation, that of a Nazarite. Another objection is the feebleness of the sense, here especially unsuitable, and the impossibility of accounting for the כִּי at the beginning, and כִּי in v. 17. Many other interpreters explain after the Vulgate, "Sacred stones are erected." They have in view memorials of victory and divine deliverance, and some of them here find, with *Cornelius a Lapide*, an allusion to the twelve stones, which Joshua erected on the opposite bank, after the passage through the Jordan. This interpretation has indeed more to recommend it than the former; but yet such a sense of נָזַר cannot be proved, and the double כִּי can scarcely be accounted for.

V. 17. "*For how great is his goodness, how great his beauty! Corn makes the young men and must the maidens increase.*" The *suff.* in טוּבוֹ and in יָפְיוֹ is referred by most interpreters to the people, by some of those, who, as Rosenmüller, correctly refer that in אַרְמָתוֹ to Jehovah. But there is no reason to suppose such an anomaly. It is very appropriate, that the prophet should praise with an exclamation of wonder the goodness of God, which he manifests to his people, and the beauty in which he appears to him. This explanation even gives a finer sense than the other. It is confirmed by the parallel passage, Jer. 31 : 12; "They come and exult on the height of Zion, and flow together to the goodness of Jehovah, to the corn and the must and the oil," which so harmonizes with the passage before us, that its use by Zechariah might almost be assumed; comp. also v. 14, "My people shall be full of my goodness." Ps. 31 : 20. "How great is thy goodness, טוּבְךָ, which thou hast prepared for those who fear thee." Ps. 25 : 7. — Corn and wine are here first mentioned, as a part for the whole of the divine blessings. Where there is an abundance of both, there is a rapid increase of the population. Altogether similar is Ps. 72 : 17; "If also there be only a handful of corn in the land, yet shall its fruit rustle on the summit of the mountains, like Lebanon, and they shall bloom forth from the city, as the grass of the earth," by which latter words, at the same time, the figure of *making to spring up* in this verse, is illustrated. The abundance of the means of subsistence, and increase of the population, belongs to the Theocratic blessings, as the opposite to the Theocratic judgments. The specification of young men and maidens, indicates that the children should not be prematurely taken away, as happens in the time of public calamity, but attain to full age, comp. Is. 65 : 20, "There shall no more be there children, who do not reach their days, or old persons, who do not fill up their years."

Chap. 10.

V. 1. "*Ask the Lord for rain at the time of the latter rain; immediately the Lord causes lightnings, and gives to them an abundant rain, to each one grass on his field.*" The verse stands in the closest connexion with the foregoing. By misunderstanding the

imper. שְׁאָלוּ, most interpreters regard it not as a continuation of the preceding representation, but as the commencement of a new train of thought. The prophet is supposed to proceed from the promises to an exhortation, which contains at the same time a reproof. Thus e. g. Calvin: "*Postquam ostendit Zach., deum ita fore beneficum erga Judæos, ut nihil illis desit ad beatam et fœlicem vitam, nunc perstringit eorum incredulitatem, quod non exspectent a domino, quæ paratus esset large illis præstare. Quoniam ergo per eos tantum stabat, quominus frucrentur omni copia bonorum, insimulat eos hic ingratitudinis.*" Most interpreters suppose מֵיְהוָה to be especially emphatic; from the Lord, not as heretofore from idols; and appeal particularly to the מִן at the beginning of v. 2, as admitting of no other interpretation. But it is plain they entirely miss the sense. Michaelis very justly remarks: "*Imperativus non onerosus, sed beneficii ac privilegii et juris in rem cum annexa spe certæ exauditionis.*" The exhortation *to ask*, expresses the highest readiness of God to give what is desired, i. q.; Ye need only ask, it requires a bare request. Altogether similar is שְׁאוּבוּ, chap. 9: 12; comp. also 1 Kings 3: 5, "God said to Solomon; Ask what I shall give thee." 2 Kings 2: 9; Ps. 2: 8. After this apostrophe, which contains indirectly the promise, the prophet returns to the direct expression of it, as in chap. 9: 12. The phrase "at the time of the latter rain" is merely as a part for the whole, an expression of the thought, "at the time when ye need rain"; and we cannot thence conclude, that the latter rain was more necessary for the growth of vegetation, than the former. Elsewhere, as Joel 2: 23, both are united. The choice of the name *Jehovah* is not without design. Rain was one of the *Theocratic* blessings, which the people enjoyed in case of true dependence on the Lord. The prophet has in view the passage, Deut. 11: 13–15, the words of which he partly employs; "If thou wilt hearken to my commandments," &c., "so give I thee the rain of your land in its time, the former and the latter rain, and thou gatherest thy corn, thy wine, and thy must. Also give I grass (עֵשֶׂב) *on thy field* for thy cattle." The rain, among the multitude of the Theocratic blessings, is here rendered prominent only as a part for the whole. The lightnings are mentioned as its precursors, Jer. 10: 13. "He maketh lightnings with rain." Ps. 135: 7. גְּשָׁמִים מַשְׁאִיר, a peculiarly abundant rain, as is usual in a thunderstorm. The connexion of two synonymes in the *stat. constr.* is of itself emphatic, e. g., Ps. 40: 3; and גֶּשֶׁם differs from מָטָר, so that the

latter signifies rain in general, the former a violent rain. The phrase, "every one," &c., indicates the extent of the blessing, which is not limited, as is usually the case with thundershowers, to one particular place. עֵשֶׂב, according to several interpreters, comprehends in a more general sense all that serves for the nourishment of man, and so it is certainly found in some passages in Genesis. But the later usage, and particularly the comparison of the cited passage of Deuteronomy, where the עֵשֶׂב is limited to the food of beasts, shows that the prophet mentions one species, only as a part for the whole. Michaelis and Rosenmüller erroneously take בַּעֲדָה as a periphrasis of the genitive. The comparison with the cited passage of Deuteronomy shows, that בַּשָּׂדֶה is to be connected not with עֵשֶׂב, but with יִתֵּן. The field (which belongs to the man) is i. q. his field, comp. בְּשָׂדֶךָ.

V. 2. "*For the teraphim speak nothingness, and the soothsayers see lies, and the dreams speak vanity; falsely do they console; therefore do they wander as a flock; are harassed because they have no shepherds.*" כִּי does not refer to v. 1 alone, but to the whole compass of the divine promises contained in the preceding context. "I will have compassion on my people and abundantly bless them; for now they have fallen into great distress by their apostasy from me." כִּי consequently gives the reason of the divine assistance; the misery and necessities of the people, whom God for the sake of "his covenant, sealed with blood," can never forsake. The phrase, "for the teraphim speak, &c., therefore," is i. q. "for because," &c. The verbs נָסָעוּ, חָזוּ, דָּבְּרוּ, most interpreters regard as proper preterites, alleging that the manifestations of apostasy from God here described, belong rather to the period before, than after the exile. For the refutation of this view, an appeal to יְרַבְּרוּ and עָנֵּנוּ would not be sufficient. The *fut.* not unfrequently expresses the idea of custom, even in the case of actions, which, frequently repeated in former times, have now ceased, comp. Ewald, p. 527. But a sufficient objection is furnished by אֶפְקוֹד in v. 3, which cannot be understood otherwise, than as a proper *fut.* As the punishment of the wicked shepherds is there predicted as future, so the misery of the people, caused indirectly by the shepherds, directly by their own apostasy from God, cannot possibly be considered as already past. The præters are accordingly to be taken as prophetic præters. But the inquiry now arises, how the prophet could place in the future, manifestations of apostasy from God, which, according to the testimony

of history, hardly appeared any more in the present, (comp. nevertheless the accounts of false prophets even in the new colony, Neh. 6: 10, &c., and the mention of conjurors, Mal. 3: 12,) but on the contrary had been of frequent occurrence in the past. That that solution of the difficulty, which assumes as an account of it, that the second part was composed before the exile, is not the true one, appears, apart from every thing else, even from the verbal agreement of this passage with several of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, whom Zechariah most frequently imitates, comp. e. g. Jer. 27 : 9, "And ye shall not hearken to your prophets, and your soothsayers, and your dreamers, and your augurs, and your magicians." 29 : 8, "Let not your prophets and your soothsayers deceive you, and ye shall not hearken to the dreams which ye dream." Ez. 21 : 34, "While the false prophets see for thee a nullity, and while the soothsayers prophecy for thee lies." 22 : 28, "They see a nullity and prophesy to thee lies." 34 : 7, "See ye not vain visions, and speak lying prophecies?" The true explanation is this. Shortly before, and during the exile, in the most calamitous times of the state, false prophets in greater numbers than at any former period appeared in Jerusalem, as well as among the exiles; and the willing obedience, which the people rendered to them, was one chief cause of their misery. By foretelling nothing but prosperity, they effaced the impressions, which the threatening predictions of the true prophets had made, whom they endeavoured to represent as gloomy fanatics, and therefore hindered the people from that conversion, which was the only means of their deliverance. Jer. 23: 9, 10, brings against the priests and false prophets the charge, that, through their guilt, the whole land was filled with crimes and cursings. "They strengthen," he says, v. 14, "the hands of the evildoers, that they repent not." "From the prophets of Jerusalem," he complains, v. 15, "crime has gone out over the whole land." Now Zechariah, who had taken for his model chiefly the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and to whom the fearful effects of this manifestation of the apostasy were so obvious, represents under its image that, which in future times should lead the people away from the law of God, and cause them to apostatize from him. That this supposition is entirely natural is evident even from the analogies in this chapter alone. What is it else, e g., when, v. 10, Egypt is used to designate the land from which the covenant people shall at a future period be brought back? Or when, according to v. 11, God conducts Israel anew through the Red Sea? Is not the future here

also represented under the image of the past, which is essentially identical with it, and only differs in its individual character? — The teraphim (comp. Jahn, *Archäol.* III. p. 504,) occur for the last time, before we meet with them in this passage, in Ezek. 21: 26, where the king of Babylon, uncertain what resolution to form, consults them. Among the Hebrews, they were intermediate beings, by which they sought to learn the future from Jehovah; the consultation of them, therefore, did not involve total idolatry. This appears from Judges 17: 5, comp. with 18: 5, 6; Hos. 3: 4. This remark makes the passage harmonize with those of Jeremiah and Ezekiel concerning the false prophets shortly before and during the exile, in which they always appear as those, who prophesied falsely in the name of Jehovah, and not in the name of a strange God. As intermediate beings, the teraphim in every religion to which they belong, must have a different place and import. Among the different senses of אָוֶן, that of *nullity*, the ground meaning, must here be assumed on account of the three following names, which correspond with it. Nullity; prophecies followed by no corresponding result, especially promises of a happy future, by which they deceive their votaries. They *see lies*. Zechariah, even when speaking of the false prophets, employs the verb, which designates the peculiar form in which the true prophets received their revelations, (comp. Vol. I. p. 221,) because the false hypocritically imitated the ἔκστασις of the true; and of this they were sometimes perfectly aware, and at others more or less unconscious. In like manner, Ezekiel in the cited passages: the creation of the objects of their vision by their own agency, while they were presented by God to the inward eye of the true prophets, he designates, chap. 13: 2, by the appellation, "prophets out of their own heart;" comp. v. 3, "They walk according to their heart, and according to that which they have not seen." — חֲלֹמוֹת is not to be connected with the חַשְׁוְא in the *stat. constr.* after the Syriac and several later interpreters, partly on account of the accents, partly on account of the parallelism, which requires that חַשְׁוְא should correspond with אָוֶן and שֶׁקֶר. Just as little can we, with some other interpreters, take חֲלֹמוֹת in the sense *dreamers*. The word never occurs besides in this sense, and the parallel passage, Jer. 27: 9, shows, that here also the usual meaning, *dreams*, is the true one. Dreams are personified, and made to speak. The article in חַשְׁוְא points to the contrast with another kind of dreams, those which speak the truth. — עַל־כֵּן therefore, viz. because they give themselves

up to these lying prophets, and, confirmed by them in their false security, are kept from conversion, the condition of all Theocratic blessings. — The verb נָבַץ, *to depart*, here especially of the straying of sheep from their protecting folds, and of their dispersion, comp. Jer. 50 : 6, " My people are like perishing sheep, whose shepherds lead them astray ; they make them wander on the mountains, they go from mountain to hill, and forget their folds." — Because they have *no* shepherd, i. e. no one who really deserves this name, who discharges the duties of his office. For it appears from v. 3, that the people should not be without shepherds, though they rather deserved the name of wolves.

V. 3. " *My anger is kindled against the shepherds, and I will punish the he-goats ; for the Lord of hosts visits his flock, the house of Judah, and makes them like his parade-horse in war.*" The miserable condition of the people, their destitution of shepherds, had been represented in the preceding verse as their own fault. But the Lord here promises, notwithstanding, that he will deliver them from their wicked leaders, the culpable instruments of their punishment. Very properly Calvin : " *Hinc apparet, quam cara sit deo salus hominum, quoniam vindictam denuntiat pastoribus, qui tamen non exercuerant tyrannidem suam, nisi erga homines dignos tali pœna. Fuit enim hæc justa merces scelerum, quod dominus voluit grassari lupos pastorum loco. Sed quanquam tale supplicium meriti essent Judæi, deus tamen irascitur pastoribus, quoniam in genere semper solicitus est de sua ecclesia. — Deo enim semper adoptio sua pretiosa est : quoniam dignatus fuerat populum illum eligere, fieri aliter non potuit, quin ruinam ejus indigne ferret.*" The interpreters hesitate whether by the shepherds to understand merely the civil magistrates, or at the same time, the spiritual leaders of the people. It is true, that both sometimes occur combined under this appellation (comp. chap. 11 : 8) ; here, however, the prophet seems, like Ezekiel and Jeremiah, (comp. e. g. chap. 23, where the prophet, v. 1 – 8, threatens the wicked shepherds, the kings, and magistrates, then, v. 9 to the end, the false prophets, and the wicked priests, as the second cause of the calamities of the people,) in most passages to have in view only the former. This appears from the antithesis in v. 4, where the discourse relates only to able civil and military leaders, which the Lord would give to the people instead of their former base ones. It is also evident from the expression, " They are harassed, because they have no shepherd," where by the עָנָה the evil

shepherds are represented as the direct, and by the עַל־כֵּן the lying prophets, or generally the evil spiritual rulers of the people, as the indirect cause of their misery. Comp. Num. 27 : 17 ; Ezek. 34 : 5. Finally, the figurative representation of the deliverance of the flock, by freeing them from their evil shepherds, is very common in Ezekiel and Jeremiah, and probably derived from them by Zechariah; comp. e. g. Jer. 23, where the Lord promises to punish the shepherds, to collect the flock from their dispersion in all lands, and give them good shepherds, at last the Messiah ; Ezek. 34 : 10, where God delivers the flock out of the hand of their evil shepherds, and now undertakes to be himself their shepherd. We have here only still to inquire, whether we are to refer this with Mark, Michaelis, and others, to native, or with Drusius, Jahn, Köster (l. c. p. 172), to foreign, evil magistrates. That the latter were chiefly intended is at least highly probable from the emphatic contrast in v. 4, where a prominence entirely peculiar is given to the thought, that the new leaders provided for the people by God would be out of *the midst of them*. Accordingly prophecy and fulfilment most accurately coincide, although in the time of the latter, native evil rulers of the people also were not wanting. — By the *he-goats*, according to Jahn, in the antithesis with the *shepherds*, are meant the inferior officers of the people ; but the *he-goats* are plainly only a different figurative designation of the same persons. The image is taken from the he-goats which march at the head of the flocks, comp. Jer. 50 : 8, where the leaders are admonished, " Be as the he-goats before the flocks." Is. 14 : 9. In a manner entirely similar, Ezek. 34 : 17, 18, announces, that God would judge between the sheep and the he-goats, and deliver the former from the injustice of the latter. The verb פָּקַד with עַל, " to visit for punishment," with the *acc.* ; to visit only to benefit. כִּי gives the reason of the punishment to be inflicted on the evil rulers. It is the tender care of the Lord for his people, and his will to deliver them from their misery. They are *his* flock ; therefore he can no longer suffer them to be ruined by evil shepherds. — The last member is explained by Jonathan, Jarchi, Kimchi, Jahn, and others : " He makes them like a horse whose excellence is in war, therefore like an excellent war-horse." But the interpretation, " he makes them his parade-horse in war," has in its favor not only the accents, but also, what is of considerable importance in the prophecy of Zechariah, the great boldness and sublimity of the figure. Judah is here, in the war which the Lord carries on

against the oppressors of his people, his stately, richly-ornamented war-horse, just as before Judah was his bow, and Ephraim his arrow. כְּ frequently stands, where an object is to be represented, not as different from that compared with it, but rather as perfectly corresponding to its idea without in such a case losing the nature of a particle of comparison, since it even compares the object with the idea. Thus e. g. Is. 1 : 7, "Desolation is as a devastation by strangers," although the predicted desolation itself was to be effected by external enemies, v. 8, "Jerusalem is as a besieged city;" although Jerusalem appeared to the prophet, not, as is commonly and erroneously supposed, to the outward senses, but to the inward contemplation, as besieged. A parade-horse, סוּס הוֹד, is a select horse, such as an earthly king is accustomed to ride in war, stately by nature, and decorated with costly housings and other ornaments.

V. 4. "*Out of the midst of him will be the corner-stone, out of him will be the fire and battle-bow, out of him will come forth every ruler.*" That the *suff.* in מִמֶּנּוּ does not refer to God, as some interpreters suppose, but to Judah, is evident even from the parallel passage, Jer. 30 : 21, "And his mighty one shall be out of him, and his ruler shall go forth from the midst of him," which the prophet here had plainly in view. The sense is, Having attained to perfect freedom by the help of the Lord, who gives victory to their arms, they shall now receive rulers and magistrates from among themselves, and an independent power in war, and, while they were formerly a prey to foreign conquerors, they shall now inspire even foreign nations with terror. — The senses of פִּנָּה are thus arranged by Winer. 1. *Angulus.* 2. *Turris muralis. Nam in angulis murorum exstrui solebant turres et propugnacula.* 3. *Vir princeps, qui est propugnaculo, dux.* But this arrangement is evidently wrong. The frequent figurative designation of princes, or rulers of the people, by corner or corner-stone, is rather grounded on the comparison of the state with a building, which rests on the prince as its corner-stone. This is evident from passages, like Ps. 118 : 22, "The stone which the builders rejected, has become the corner-stone;" Is. 28 : 16, "I lay in Zion a precious corner-stone." The assertion also of Gesenius (*in loco*), is not altogether correct, that פִּנָּה in such a case signifies exactly a *corner-stone*, and therefore stands for אֶבֶן הַפִּנָּה, or רֹאשׁ הַפִּנָּה. The whole is rather put for the part which it includes; we must not, however, on that account regard both as being verbally the same. We have already met with a

similar misconception in respect to the corners of the altar, ch. 9 : 16, and it frequently occurs in the interpreters, e. g. in the supposition that שֹׁרֶשׁ, *root*, in Isaiah, sometimes signifies exactly *root-sprout*. The opposite of what Isaiah here predicts to Judah, Jeremiah (51 : 26,) predicts to Babylon: "They will no more take from thee a stone for a corner, and a stone for a foundation;" on which Michaelis justly remarks: "*Sensus: non erit amplius de gente Chaldæorum, qui reipublicæ sustentaculum, h. e. rex aut princeps futurus sit.*" The erroneousness of the supposition of Mark, that פִּנָּה here, as in some other passages, signifies works of defence built in the corners of the walls, appears from this and the other parallel passages of Jeremiah, already cited, and moreover from יָתֵד, which necessarily requires to be figuratively understood. This latter word has been very strikingly explained by Lowth on Is. 22 : 23, where it is said of Eliakim, "I drive him in as a peg in a firm place, — and they hang upon it all the splendor of his father's house." It is customary in the East to furnish the inside of apartments with rows of large nails, or pegs, which are wrought into the wall when it is built, (comp. Chardin, in Harmer's *Observations*, III. p. 49.) On these firm nails, already prepared, they hang all kinds of household stuff. They serve, therefore, as a suitable image of those men who are the supports and pillars of the whole being of the state. On the contrary, this passage of Isaiah, as well as the one before us, has been strangely misunderstood by Gesenius. "יָתֵד," he says, "*nail* or *peg*, stands here precisely for a firm dwelling-place, Ezr. 9 : 8, Zech. 10 : 4." — But how can a man drive a firm dwelling-place into a firm place! How would this suit v. 24, where it is said of Shebna: "Then shall the peg, driven into a firm place, give way, and it shall be cut off, and fall, and the whole burden, which hangs upon it, breaks." How can even the most superficial observer find the sense, "firm dwelling-place," suitable in the passage before us? Parallel also is Ezek. 15 : 3, where the prophet, comparing Israel with the wild vine, says, "Can one take from it a peg in order to hang thereon all instruments?" On the contrary, those passages have an entirely different character, where images are taken from the pegs with which the tent is fastened. The *war-bow* stands here for the military power, or the *apparatus bellicus* in general. Thus not unfrequently, "to break the bow," or "strike it out of the hand," for "to deprive one of his armour and weapons." 1 Sam. 2 : 4; Ezek. 39 : 3; Hos. 1 : 5. — According to the usual opinion of interpreters, נוֹגֵשׂ here stands

in a good sense for *regent*. But the passages appealed to are not conclusive. Is. 3: 5, 12, the word is plainly used of tyrannical rulers, and Is. 60: 17, "I establish thy magistrates for peace, and thy rulers נְגָשֶׂיךָ, for righteousness," plainly refers to the former tyrannical rulers, as appears from the immediately preceding, "instead of brass, I bring gold; instead of iron, silver." There is not, however, the smallest reason here to relinquish the usual sense, if we only refer the hardness and severity expressed by the word, not to the covenant people, but to their enemies. Rightly, Calvin: "*Potientur imperio contra vicinos, et exigent ab illis tributum, aut vectigal, quemadmodum victores solent a subditis.*" Similar is Isaiah 14: 2, "They take captive those who led them captive, and rule over their tyrants." It is in favor of this interpretation, that what follows then becomes appropriate.

V. 5. "*And they are heroes trampling on the mire of the streets in war, and they fight, for the Lord is with them, and the horsemen are put to shame.*" כְּ stands here again as in v. 3. Thus, even in prose, Neh. 7: 2, "he is as a true man," i. q. he corresponds to the idea, he is the lively image, of a true man. בּוֹסִים כְּטִיט חוּצוֹת, several translate, as Calvin, Mark, Michaelis, "treading (viz. their enemies) in the dirt of the streets." The latter is regarded as a part for the whole, to designate all the hindrances and difficulties which the covenant people with great perseverance would overcome. Against this interpretation, besides the great feebleness of the sense, is the parallel passage, Mic. 7: 10, where the dirt of the streets appears as an image of the enemies themselves, with only this difference, that in Micah, they are compared therewith, ("Mine eyes behold my enemies, now will they be trampled upon as dirt of the streets,") while the bolder Zechariah designates them directly as such. The passage has actually been so understood by not a few older interpreters, as Jonathan, Theodoret, Cyril, Grotius; and this interpretation, especially as it is confirmed also by chap. 9: 15, "they trample on sling-stones," would certainly have been generally adopted, if the construction of the verb בּוּס with a following בְּ, while it elsewhere always takes the *accus.*, had not made a difficulty. The way in which Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*, solves this difficulty: "*Et erunt instar heroum, qui hostes conculcant in bello, sicut,* ב *pro* כ, *lutum platearum,*" is not suited to increase the advocates of this interpretation. The true one is rather the following. בּוּס stands here, not, as commonly, in a transitive, but an intransitive sense;

properly they tread down, or they tread about, on the dirt of the streets. In the same manner, Ps. 49 : 15, the elsewhere transitive synonyme רָדָה is connected with בְּ of the person, נִירְדוּ בָם, "they will tread about *upon* them." Here the intransitive meaning is indicated by the form itself. The participial form קוֹם is not, as is commonly supposed and even by Ewald, p. 406, an unusual contraction of the *part. trans.*, but it is a participial form of the intransitive *Kal.* This is evident from the fact that it occurs only in intransitive verbs, e. g. קוֹם, אוֹר, בּוֹשׁ. The only forms where it is supposed to occur in a transitive sense, נוֹחִי, Ps. 22 : 10, and נוֹזִי, Ps. 71 : 6, rest, as may easily be shown, on a false interpretation. The verb נוּחַ never occurs, not even in Mic. 4 : 10, in a transitive sense, and therefore, even in the cited passage, נוֹחִי cannot be understood as a *part.* נוֹזִי is not to be derived from נוּז, but from נָזָה, (comp. Gesenius and Winer s. v.) — In נִלָּחֲמוּ "they war," there is a contrast with the hitherto passive conduct of the covenant people, their passive subjugation. Now by the aid of the Lord brave warriors are formed from despised slaves. On the contrary, their oppressors, hitherto the proud hostile horsemen, are covered with shame and disgrace. The appropriateness of the latter antithesis makes it proper to understand הַבִּישׁוּ intransitively, with all ancient translators; and it occurs also, chap. 9 : 5, and below, v. 11. The cavalry in Dan. 11 : 40, also is designated as the chief strength of the host of the Grecian ruler of Syria, viz. Antiochus Epiphanes.

V. 6. "*And I strengthen the house of Judah and give prosperity to the house of Joseph, and I make them dwell; for I have compassion on them, and they shall be as though I had not cast them away, for I am the Lord their God and will hear them.*" The relation in which this promise stands to the circumstances of Zechariah's time is well developed by Calvin: "*Prosequitur Zach. eandem doctrinam, nempe opus illud redemtionis, cujus principium cernebant Judæi, non fore mutilum, quia dominus tandem implebit, quod cœpit facere. Neque enim poterant acquiescere Judæi in illis principiis, quæ vix centesima ex parte respondebant promissionibus dei. — Ergo in eo nunc insistit propheta, ut Judæi patienter quiescant, donec tempus maturum advenerit, quo dominus ostendat, se non aliqua tantum ex parte, sed in solidum populi sui esse redemtorem.*" הוֹשַׁבוֹתִים is taken by most interpreters after Kimchi and Abenezra, as a *forma mixta* from הֲשִׁיבוֹתִים, Hiph. of שׁוּב, and הוֹשַׁבְתִּים, Hiph. of יָשַׁב. The prophet by means of this artful combination is supposed to express

with one word, what Jeremiah, 32:37, has expressed by a whole sentence: וְהֲשִׁיבֹתִים אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וְהוֹשַׁבְתִּים לָבֶטַח. This supposition has, it is true, in its favor the constant effort at brevity perceptible in Zechariah in relation to the parallel passages in the older prophets, as an effect of which this strange combination need not surprise us, especially if we take into view the time of Zechariah; although no examples besides of any such mixed form occur. But, nevertheless, another reason proves those to be correct, who assert that Zechariah, by a permutation of the verbs עו with those פי, *peculiar* to that late period, has employed this anomalous form, instead of the regular הוֹשַׁבְתִּים, (comp. Ewald, p. 489.) The mention of the *return*, in particular, is here out of place; the representation of it does not begin till v. 8; here the prophet still speaks of Judah and Israel in connexion; the former had already returned; only to the latter, most of whom at least still continued in exile, is the return promised in what follows. The verb *to dwell* is especially emphatic. Hitherto the covenant people in their own land, under a foreign dominion, had been as strangers. Now, for the first time after their oppressors are vanquished and driven out, shall they become properly dwellers and possessors, as they had been in the times before the exile. Similar is Ezek. 36:11, "I make you to dwell as in your former time, and do you good as in your past time." "And they shall be," "and I will hear them," is the looser Hebrew connexion for, "therefore shall they be, therefore will I hear them." God's compassionate benevolence, and his covenant relation to the people of Israel, are the ground of their deliverance, comp. Is. 41:17, "I, Jehovah, (the Theocratic name of God,) will hear them. I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them."

V. 7. "*And Ephraim is as a hero, and their heart rejoices as wine, and their sons see it and rejoice, their heart exults in the Lord.*" The prophet, from this verse onward, occupies himself exclusively with Ephraim. At first he promises that descendants also of the citizens of the former kingdom of the ten tribes, shall participate in the glorious struggle; he then gives the greater promise, that, after this struggle, the large mass of the people also, who during its continuance were still scattered in all lands, should return to their native country, and to their ancient covenant relation to the Lord. That the prophet occupies himself so earnestly and fully with Ephraim, is explained, as Calvin rightly saw, only by the circumstances of the time in which he lived. Had the predictions of the

older prophets in reference to Judah then first begun to be fulfilled, and did they therefore need, in order that the people might not believe themselves deceived, to be resumed; much more was this the case in regard to those which related to Ephraim. The great mass of this tribe were still in exile, although a part of them had joined themselves to the returning Jews, (comp. Jahn, *Archäol.* 2, 1, p. 236 sq.,) and the hope of the great future restoration, promised by the prophets, had only a weak point of connexion with the present. — With respect to "as wine," comp. what has been said on 9 : 15. A similar merely suggested comparison is, "as potash," Is. 1 : 25, for "as potash purifies," comp. other examples in Ewald, p. 614. That the sons of the Ephraimites should participate in their prosperity, shows that it was not to be merely of a short duration. As the object of יִרְאוּ, the whole contents of the foregoing prediction of prosperity are to be supplied. The construction of the verb גיל with ב is explained by the circumstance, that the joy is considered as depending on the Lord.

V. 8. The prophet now proceeds from that portion of the Ephraimites, who should take part in the struggle of the Jews against the Greeks, to the far greater portion, who at that time were still in exile. — "*I will hiss to them and collect them, for I have redeemed them, and they become numerous, as they were before.*" The figure of hissing is taken from the bee-master, who, by means of a whistle, calls the swarms of bees out of and into their hives, comp. Lowth on Is. 5 : 26. The meaning of the figure in the passage is well unfolded by Calvin : "*Per verbum sibilandi intelligit Sach., non fore opus hoc arduum deo, sicuti solemus metiri ejus opera sensu carnis nostræ. Quum ergo Judæis objicere promtum esset, per varias terras et sub diversis gentibus fratres suos esse dispersos, ita ut collectio minime esset credibilis, propheta occurrit dicens; solo sibilo vel solo nutu deum posse ipsos reducere in patriam, — utcunque totus mundus eorum reditum impediat. Conjungi ergo debent hæc duo verba : Sibilabo illis et congregabo eos : quasi dixisset illis Sach., sufficere deo solum nutum, ubi volet populum suum colligere.*" — "*For I have redeemed them.*" This is to be understood of the divine counsel. As soon as this has once been taken, nothing can hinder the execution. The question now arises respecting the restoration here mentioned. Grotius supposes, that the prophet here announces that the victory of the Maccabees, and the happy condition of the land afterwards, will be to many of the Israelites, still in a strange land, an inducement to

return. But the sense of the promise, which is far more comprehensive is hereby, to say the least, not exhausted, especially as, v. 9, the return of the exiles is placed in close connexion with their conversion. The return of the ten tribes always belongs in the prophets to the Messianic hopes. We must, therefore, with Calvin, Mark, and others, assume that the prophet, chiefly at least, had in view here the reception of the Israelites into the Theocracy by Christ. That this was represented by a return to Palestine, the seat of the Theocracy at the time of the prophet, is justified by the general character of the prophetic discourse, and is particularly free from difficulty in the case of one with whom this figure, in general, so much prevails, (comp. e. g. v. 11.) Appropriately Calvin: "*Significat propheta, Christum sic fore caput ecclesiæ, ut colligat ex omnibus terræ partibus Judæos, qui prius dispersi fuerant: atque ita extendatur restitutio promissa ad omnes tribus.*"

V. 9. "*And I will sow them among the nations, and in distant lands will they remember me, and with their children live again and return.*" — The exile, which seemed to be a sign of the perpetual rejection of Israel, shall be a direct means of his conversion and restoration. This Moses had already prophesied, Deut. 4 : 27 sq., "The Lord will scatter you among the nations. — And ye will there serve strange gods. — Finally, however, ye will seek the Lord your God, and find him, because ye will seek him with all the heart, and all the soul. In thy distress thou wilt at a future period return to the Lord." In like manner, Ezek. 6 : 11, "And they that escape of you shall remember me among the nations, whither they shall be carried captive, — and loathe themselves on account of the evil that they have done, — and know that I am the Lord." This prophecy, which, in reference to the Jews, had already in part been fulfilled by the change of mind they experienced in the exile, and by the return which resulted from it, the prophet here resumes in reference to the Israelites. The verb זָרַע is frequently used of the dispersion of the covenant people as a punishment. We cannot, however, be satisfied with this meaning here; the context and parallelism require that the words, *and I will sow them*, should contain, at least, at the same time something of a joyful character. The dispersed Israelites, who are hereafter to be still more scattered, shall be a seed sown of God, which will bring forth rich fruits. An entirely similar double sense, "God will disperse," and "God will sow," is found in the name *Jezreel*, which Hosea gives to one of his sons, the type of the Israel-

itish people, comp. 1 : 4, 2 : 24. Worthy of remark is the prediction here, which has been confirmed by the result of a still wider dispersion of the Israelites than that which then happened. In the expression, *and they live*, the image is intimated in one word, which Ezekiel, chap. 37, has so well carried out; comp. e. g. v. 14, "And I put my spirit within you, and ye revive, and I make you rest in your land." The often misinterpreted phrase, *with your children*, designates here also, as v. 7, the permanency of the benefit. This is shown by the parallel passage of Ezek. 37 : 25, "And they inhabit the land, which I have given to my servant Jacob, they and their children, and their children's children for ever."

V. 10. "*And I bring them back out of the land of Egypt, and out of Ashur will I collect them, and to the land of Gilead and Lebanon will I bring them, and they shall find no room.*" This verse is an individualization of the foregoing. The interpreters here find a difficulty in the mention of Egypt as a land out of which the exiles shall be brought back, while no carrying away of the citizens of the kingdom of the ten tribes to Egypt can be pointed out in history. Most assume, that, at the destruction of this kingdom by the Assyrians, many of its inhabitants fled into Egypt, to avoid being carried away. It is, however, a suspicious circumstance, that history is entirely silent on this point. But, although the fact were conceded, still this passage cannot be referred to it. The comparison of v. 11, particularly shows, that the Egyptians, as well as the Assyrians, must be regarded as powerful oppressors of the Israelites, while, in the case supposed, they must have given the Israelites a hospitable reception. It therefore only remains for us to assume, that Egypt is here mentioned because it was the first land in which the Israelites had suffered an oppressive captivity, (comp. Is. 52 : 4, "My people went down in the beginning to Egypt, in order to dwell there, and Ashur did them violence in the end,") that it is a figurative designation of the lands, in which the ten tribes were in exile at the time of the prophet, and would be at a future period. The transition to this mode of representation, appears in passages like Is. 10 : 24, "Fear not, my people, before Ashur, who smites thee with a staff and raises his rod against thee as Egypt," בְּדֶרֶךְ מִצְרָיִם. As now it was the constant practice of the prophets, and the poets generally, to place the comparison instead of the thing compared, the transition was easy to the representation which prevails in the passage before us. In favor of it, however, not only analogies, (comp.

Vol. I. p. 231, and above, on chap. 5 : 10,) but even passages can be produced, where Egypt itself is placed in a manner entirely similar. The two most remarkable are Hosea 8 : 13, "Now will he remember their sins and punish their misdeeds; they shall return to Egypt." Chap. 9 : 3, "They shall not dwell in the land of the Lord, and Ephraim turns back to Egypt, and in Ashur they shall eat what is unclean." It is obvious that here, the lands into which the Israelites should in future be carried away captive, are figuratively designated by Egypt, a land in which they had at first been reduced to bondage, and a return to which could not have been in the mind of the prophet, who anticipated danger only from the Assyrians. It is further remarkable, that the prophet, chap. 9 : 6, extending the image even farther, names Memphis as a city where the Israelites would find their grave. — If now it is established, that Zechariah in this place does not mean Egypt proper, so neither by Ashur connected therewith, here and v. 11, are we to understand any particular kingdom. Ashur is rather, in like manner, a figurative designation of those kingdoms in which the Israelites were in exile during the time of the prophet, and would be at a future period. This demonstration, however, does not entirely invalidate the proof, which has been derived from the passage before us, against the integrity of Zechariah, (comp. e. g. Bertholdt, *Einl.* IV. p. 1714. 24.) The question still arises, how a prophet, after the captivity, could choose the Egyptians and Assyrians as the type of the oppressors of his people, while he omitted the Chaldeans, who had been their most destructive enemies. This difficulty would be invincible, if the prophet were here speaking of the Jews alone, or even merely of the whole of the covenant people. When, e. g. Is. 27 : 13, it is said, "The exiles in the land of Ashur, and the banished in the land of Egypt, come and pray before the Lord on the holy mountain of Jerusalem," although Egypt and Ashur are here in like manner typical, as Gesenius very justly remarks, ("instead of the different lands of the world in which the Jews have been scattered, Assyria and Egypt are here mentioned,") yet Kleinert is in the right, (on the Genuineness of Is., I. p. 317 sq.,) when he considers this passage as an incontrovertible proof against the composition of the whole portion, chap. 24 – 27, in the exile, and in favor of its genuineness. Or when, Isaiah 19 : 23 sq., Egypt and Ashur are mentioned as the two kingdoms heretofore most hostile to the covenant people, and to one another, which in the time of the Messiah should be closely united with the

covenant people, and with one another, by the common worship of the Lord, and live in the most peaceful intercourse; so is the genuineness of this portion, even thereby, sufficiently established. But in the passage before us the difficulty is only apparent. The prophet speaks solely of the Ephraimites. For them Egypt and Assyria had actually been exclusively the most dangerous enemies of former time; therefore they only, and not the Chaldeans, who did not make their appearance until the extinction of the kingdom of the ten tribes, were suited to be a type of their enemies in general. Zechariah here occupies the same point of view as Hosea, who, chap. 11 : 11, in reference to the Israelites, prophesies, "they will return out of Egypt and Ashur." Finally, the prophet certainly had directly before his eyes the cited passages, in which Egypt and Ashur are connected in the same relation with each other as here. — The whole argument serves at the same time to show how little reason there is to protest against understanding the restoration to the promised land figuratively. If it cannot be denied that the lands, out of which the Israelites are brought back, are to be understood only as types, what objection can be urged, if the land to which they shall be restored, is, in like manner, regarded as a type? — The land of Gilead and Lebanon is here not a designation of the whole promised land, as most interpreters suppose, but specially of the former country of the ten tribes. This was divided into two parts, that beyond the Jordan, the land of Gilead, and that on this side, which extended to Libanus, and therefore might suitably receive its name from it. — The verb כָּצָא occurs also, Num. 11 : 22, and Josh. 17 : 16, (comp. Maurer on the passage,) in Kal and Niphal, in the sense *to suffice*, so that it is not necessary here to assume an ellipsis (*non invenietur eis, scil. locus sufficiens*), which is inadmissible in those passages.

V. 11. "*And the Lord goes through the sea, the distress, and smites in the sea the waves, and all the floods of the Nile are put to shame, and the pride of Ashur is overthrown, and the staff of Egypt shall yield.*" The former deliverances of the covenant people served them as a pledge of those that were future; since they revealed, at the same time, the power and the will of the Lord to help them, who is at all times the same. Nothing, therefore, is more natural than that the prophet in the description of the future should bring to memory the past, and thus, as it were, call upon the Lord, not to be unlike himself, and also strengthen the faith of the people in the

promises which contradicted indeed the appearance of things. This frequently happens when the past and future are brought into comparison, comp. e. g. Is. 51 : 9, "Awake, put on strength, thou arm of Jehovah, awake as the days of former times, as the ancient generations." — "Art thou not it who driedst up the sea, the water of the great deep, who madest the depths of the sea for a way on which the redeemed went through?" But, in like manner also, they often employed the past as a type for the future; they frequently transferred the former in its individual character to the latter, which is explained partly from the flowing together of figure and reality, proper to poetry in general, and partly from the nature of prophecy in particular. Thus it is said, Jer. 31 : 2, "The people find favor in the wilderness, who remain of the sword; the Lord goes to bring Israel to rest:" as the Lord once pitied his people, when sorely plagued in the wilderness, on account of their continual apostasy, and led the remnant of them to Canaan; so also will he pity them in their present distress, of which they are themselves the cause, and lead them back into their native land. Thus Hos. 2 : 16, 17, "I lead her into the wilderness, and speak to her heart, and give her her vineyards there, and the valley of Achor, for a door of hope;" for, "as I comforted Israel aforetime in the wilderness by promises of prosperity, and then, at the very entrance into the land of Canaan, filled them with joyful hopes by a sight of the fruitful region; so will I also in the future comfort and richly bless them." Especially remarkable, however, is the passage, Is. 11 : 15, 16, which Zechariah has so plainly imitated, that it must of itself be sufficient to render very suspicious the idea, that the second part was composed by an earlier writer, especially as it also serves at the same time to prove other later prophets, between whom and Zechariah a similar agreement is found, particularly Jeremiah and Ezekiel, to have been independent in relation to him. — In reference to the subject of עָבַר interpreters are not agreed. Several regard as such צָרָה. So Calvin: "*transibit in mari afflictio*," Flügge, "a plague passes over the sea," against which it is a sufficient objection, that צָרָה never indicates active, but always passive distress. The people is commonly taken as the subject; then however the change of persons, which immediately occurs without any notice, since the following *and he smites* must refer to the Lord, is unnatural. The truth was seen by Mark. It is the Lord, who, at the head of the Israelites marches boldly through the sea, and strikes down their proud opposers, the

roaring waves. "He goes through the field of floods, the victorious hero." A complete parallel is furnished by Ps. 114, where the sea, as it sees the Lord advance in front of the Israelites, quickly flees, the terrified Jordan turns back. It was unnecessary expressly to mention the Lord, Him, who was continually present to the soul of the prophet, who alone could accomplish such deeds, the only deliverer of his people. Altogether similar is Is. 2 : 4, Mic. 4 : 3. In respect to the interpretation of צָרָה there is great diversity, though it is not difficult, since only one explanation of it can be grammatically justified. After the Seventy (*ἐν θαλάσσῃ στενῇ*), Jerome (*in maris freto*), several, even Jahn, connect צָרָה with the foregoing יָם, in the sense *narrowness of the sea.* But against this the simple grammatical reason is sufficient, that יָם could not then have the article, and besides, to render prominent the narrowness of the sea, were here in the wrong place, since it would rather serve to diminish the miracle; lastly, צָרָה always occurs of narrowness in a metaphorical sense, never in a physical. How little in such cases the etymology suffices to prove a meaning, may be exemplified by our word *anguish.* Others, as Mark, Köster, (l. c. p. 44,) explain: "*Jehovah transit per mare cum anxietate.*" But this interpretation belongs to the time when every preposition was supplied at pleasure, which was thought to be necessary, and moreover, as has been already remarked, צָרָה is never spoken of an active, but always of a passive oppression. It only remains, therefore, with Ch. B. Michaelis, to take צָרָה as standing in apposition; "he goes through the sea, the distress." It is, therefore, not merely a crude cleaving to the letter, regardless of all analogy and the whole substance of the prophecy, when the Jewish interpreters, as Jerome relates, refer the word to a future wonderful passage of the Israelites through the strait between Byzantium and Chalcedon; it is at the same time a gross misunderstanding of the letter itself. Finally, the explanation of Jonathan (*fient eis miracula et virtutes, sicut factæ sunt patribus eorum in mari*), shows, that this misunderstanding was not universal, even among the Jews. — The article in בַּיָּם points to a definite sea, the Arabian gulf, the same through which the Israelites had already once been led, comp. Is. 11 : 15, "The Lord lays a curse upon the tongue of the sea of Egypt." — In the words, *he smites the waves in the sea*, a personification of the wave, as the enemy subdued by God, lies at the foundation. The words, *all the floods of the Nile are ashamed*, contain a manifest allusion to the passage through the

Jordan. This comparatively small stream, however, is not sufficient for the prophet; he mentions instead of it the Nile, as Is. 11 : 15, the Euphrates. The latter, several interpreters, as Grotius and Mark, would here also understand by יְאוֹר; Jahn takes it for the Jordan. But both suppositions are inadmissible. It is true, that *Jeor*, Job 28 : 10, occurs in the sense *stream*, in general; in Dan. 12 : 5 sq., of the Tigris. But in the passage before us, the omission of the article, which is found in Daniel, shows, that the word stands as a proper name. As such, however, it can mean only the Nile. — That in the last words, Ashur and Egypt, as the most powerful oppressors of the Israelites formerly, stand merely as types of their tyrannical rulers in general, has already been shown. Parallel passages are Is. 10 : 27, 14 : 25, 9 : 3.

V. 12. "*And I strengthen them in the Lord, and in his name will they walk, saith the Lord.*" In בַּיהוָה the Lord is designated, as he on whom the strength of Israel depends. The use of the noun instead of the pronoun is emphatic. It calls the attention to what it means, "to receive strength from the Lord, the Almighty, and the living one." The name of the Lord signifies the whole compass of his perfections as it is designated by his name, the image and the expression of his being. A walking, which is in the name of the Lord, is one in which his perfection reveals itself in all its strength. Walking, according to the context and parallelism, cannot here relate to the conduct, but must be taken literally.

Chap. 11.

Hitherto had the prophet chiefly (comp. however, chap. 5) copied in his prophecies only the joyful side of the great picture of the future condition of the covenant people; here another scene suddenly presents itself, and, in describing it to his hearers and readers, he completes the correct, indeed, but partial representation of the future, which he had hitherto given, and guards against the abuse to which it might be liable by the carnally minded. Very appositely Calvin: "*Videntur hæc inter se pugnare; sed oportuit priore loco Judæis proponi dei beneficia, ut alacrius incumberent ad templum ædificandum, et scirent non frustra se operam consumere. Nunc*

etiam adjungi oportuit diversam admonitionem, ne hypocritæ fallaci illarum promissionem fiducia obdurescerent, quemadmodum fieri solet. Deinde ut fideles sibi metuerent in tempore, atque ita solliciti incederent coram deo : quia nihil magis exitiale est, quam securitas ; ubi enim grassatur peccandi licentia, impendet dei judicium."

The whole portion may be divided into three parts, V. 1– 3, which serve as it were for a prelude to the rest, describe the desolation of the whole land by foreign foes. The relation of a two fold symbolical action of the prophet, which took place in vision, gives a deeper insight into the causes of this event. In the first, (v. 4 – 14,) the prophet supplies the place of the great angel and revealer of the Lord, and typifies his future actions. Israel devoted to destruction by the divine decree, appears as a flock destined to the slaughter. The prophet makes an attempt to rescue them ; he undertakes the office of a shepherd over the poor flock, and labors to deliver them from the evil shepherds, who would lead them to destruction. But the refractoriness of the shepherds and the flock compels him to give up his office, and abandon the flock to the full misery, from which they had hitherto been preserved by himself. He now demands his reward ; they give him the contemptible one of thirty pieces of silver. In this way is the last manifestation of the Lord's mercy towards his people by the Messiah, and the rejection of him typified. The prophet then represents, at the command of the Lord, in a second symbolical action, the wicked shepherds, who will consume and destroy the flock, after the rejection of the good shepherd.

V. 1. "*Open, O Lebanon, thy gates, and let fire devour thy cedars.*" The representation is altogether dramatic. The prophet instead of announcing to Lebanon its future desolation, commands it to open its gates. Calvin : "*Induit personam fecialis, qui minatur atque denuntiat, jam adesse ultimam dei vindictam.*" Gates are attributed to Lebanon, as a natural bulwark. Calvin : "*Cur autem jubeat Libanum suas aperire portas, in promtu est. Paulo post vocat sylvam munitam, quæ tamen carebat mœnibus et portis.*" The ב shows the material on which the fire operates. The sense therefore is, "Thou, O Lebanon, wilt be stormed and devastated by the enemy." The inquiry now arises, whether this verse, as well as the following, is to be understood literally or allegorically. The allegorical interpretation, according to the testimony of Jarchi, Kimchi, and Abenezra, is very ancient among the Jews. From a passage of the Talmud, (Joma, 396,) it appears, that by Lebanon was

understood the temple at Jerusalem. We here cite the remarkable passage: "*Quadraginta annis ante excidium apertæ sunt portæ templi sua sponte. Objurgavit igitur eas R. Jochanan fil. Zaccai et dixit: O templum, templum, quare tu terres te ipsum? novi ego, quod finis tuus erit, ut desoleris. Nam sic prophetavit de te Zacharias, filius Iddo: Aperi, Libane, portas tuas.*" This opening of the doors of the temple is mentioned by Josephus (De Bell. Jud. 6, 5,) and it is not improbable, that it appeared to him and his contemporaries, as so weighty an omen, because the above mentioned interpretation was at that time current. The antiquity of this interpretation among the Jews, is proved also by its occurrence in several fathers, particularly Eusebius and Jerome, who probably borrowed it from them. The latter remarks: "*Aperit Libanus portas suas, ut Romanus intret exercitus, et comedat ignis cedros ejus, ut vel incendio cuncta vastentur, vel hostili impetu duces ac principes consumantur.*" Also among the later interpreters, the reference to the temple was retained by several, as e. g. Grotius. Others, on the contrary, understand by Lebanon all Jerusalem; still others, as Mark and Eichhorn, all Palestine: "*Quam ad partem septentrionalem mons iste claudebat, et quæ vere instar Libani erat supra alias terras illustris multis modis.*" Some more recent critics, as Gesenius, (on Is. 37: 24,) and Hitzig, (Studien and Critiken, Jahrg. 1830, p. 33,) proceeding on the false hypothesis of the composition of the second part before the exile, take Lebanon as an image of the kingdom of the ten tribes. The objection to all these interpretations, which entirely exclude the literal sense, is, that along with Lebanon, other parts also of Palestine are mentioned, and indeed in such a manner, that on a hostile invasion the laying waste of Lebanon must of course extend to them. This was observed by Eichhorn, (Hebr. Propheten, III. p. 380,) although, omitting the proper use of this observation, he takes Lebanon again as a designation of the whole land. "The devastation prevails through the whole land, beyond the Jordan; it seizes upon the oak forests of Basan, and annihilates the pastures; on this side the Jordan, the thicket through which the Jordan flows. There the shepherds mourn on account of their beautiful pasture grounds; here the lions, for the loss of their quiet lairs. Whoever dwells in the land laments." If it is certain that Lebanon is mentioned as the northern bulwark of the land, which being stormed, it would stand open to the invading enemies, (Cocceius: "*Libanus munimentum terræ Canaan versus septentri-*

onem est, unde omne malum ingruit in Judæos,") and the oak forests of Basan on the one side, and the shrubbery of the Jordan on the other, in order to point out that the destroying host of enemies spread themselves over the whole land, then can Lebanon neither be an image of all Judea, nor of the temple, nor of Jerusalem, and at the same time, the absurd opinion of Hitzig falls to the ground, that the description, v. 1 – 3, relates to internal dissensions in the kingdom of the ten tribes. On the other hand, however, we must still not so adhere to the literal sense, as to refer the hostile devastation, merely to the individual objects mentioned, v. 1 – 3; nay, it does not even imply that all these objects, the cedars and cypresses of Lebanon, the oaks of Basan, the shrubbery of Jordan, should be actually laid waste during the hostile invasion. In such representations, particular instances serve merely to designate the whole by an individual example ; a total devastation of the land by an invading enemy from the North is the theme, which lies at the foundation of the prophet's description, and, in carrying this out, he particularly mentions, what is especially distinguished in the land. Lebanon, with its proud cedars, must here receive the first place, even on account of the dependence of Zechariah on the earlier prophets. With them, Lebanon is a constant designation of all that is high, invincible, strong. Isaiah, 2 : 13, employs it, along with the oaks of Basan, as a part for the whole, to point out all that is high and strong on earth, and 10 : 34, as an image of the Assyrian monarchy. Chap. 40 : 16, he mentions Lebanon, to designate, by way of individualization, the highest mountain forest. The king of Assyria, Is. 37 : 24, knows no higher boast, than that he has ascended Lebanon, and cut down its lofty cedars. A passage, the comparison of which is here the more important, because in it, also, the ascension of Lebanon is to be understood at the same time literally, (Lebanon would certainly not be mentioned, if the king of Assyria had not actually scaled it, as, v. 25, another land with which the Assyrians never had any concern would certainly not be mentioned instead of Egypt,) and metaphorically, as an individual example of the conquest of every difficulty, and of victorious perseverance. Similar is Is. 14 : 8, where, in reference to the king of Babylon, it is said : " The cypresses also rejoice over thee, the cedars of Lebanon ; since thou hast fallen, no man comes to us who cuts us down." Jeremiah employs Lebanon, together with mount Gilead, as a figurative designation of the royal house of Judah, 22 : 6; " Thus saith

the Lord, concerning the house of the king of Judah; Gilead art thou to me, the head of Lebanon; surely I will change thee into a desert, into cities which are not inhabited." V. 7. "And I sanctify against thee, destroyers with their implements, and they destroy the choice of thy cedars, and make them fall together upon the fire." This passage, which the prophet, as is shown by the comparison of "they destroy the choice of thy cedars," with "which are glorious are laid waste," in v. 2, appears to have had especially in view, differs from the one before us, so far as in it Lebanon is an image of an exalted individual. Here, on the contrary, it designates, by way of individualization, all that is exalted in the land of Judea, in general; a distinction which is rendered clearer by the remark, that in the case of such an individualization, the object named is also included, while in the case of an image, it serves only as a designation of another. By confounding the two, particularly in the prophets, a multitude of false interpretations has been occasioned; comp. e. g. Gesenius *zu Jes.* 2, 13 ff. and, in general, a large number of passages of his commentary. As for the rest, Calvin, and indeed he only, has discerned the truth in the passage before us. He rejects the allegorical interpretation of Jerome and others, and remarks: "*Consilium prophetæ, deum fore vindicem contra totum populum, ut nec Hierosolymæ, nec ullis locis parcat. Ergo etiam per abietes et cedros intelligit, quidquid tunc excellebat vel in Judæa, vel aliis in locis. — Sub una specie complectitur quidquid pretiosum erat in Judæa. — Dicit propheta nullum esse locum tam difficilem accessu, qui non pervius sit, ubi dominus licentiam omnia perdendi hostibus dare volet.*" It is true, that immediately after he overlooks the difference between metaphor and individualization, when, by the shepherds, he understands people of rank, by lions, the cruel rulers of the people; and even in v. 2, refers אַדִּירִים to persons.

V. 2. "*Howl thou cypress; for the cedar falls, laid waste are the lofty. Howl ye oaks of Basan; for the strong forest is overthrown.*" The cedars in relation to the cypresses, and the mountain forest of Lebanon in contrast with the groves of Basan, stand here as an individualization of what is most distinguished and exalted in relation to what is indeed less so, but nevertheless still excellent and distinguished above the rest. Has the former not been able to withstand the conqueror, the latter sees its destruction to be the more certain; and the low and insignificant is so inevitably given up to ruin, that it need not be particularly mentioned. The cypresses (that these

are to be understood by בְּרוֹשׁ has been proved, among others, by Gesenius in the *Thes.* s. v.) are indeed placed below the cedars, but occupy the second place after them, on account of their hard and firm wood, suited to the building of palaces and ships; and, hence elsewhere also, as Is. 14 : 8, Ezek. 31 : 8, they are joined with them. In like manner the oak forests of Basan were in great esteem, as the oak in general was reckoned among the noblest trees, comp. Is. 2 : 13, Ezek. 27 : 6. In expression and contents such passages are similar, as Is. 23 : 14, "Howl ye ships of Tarshish; for your stronghold is destroyed." Jer. 49 : 3, "Howl Heshbon, for Ai is destroyed." It is, in general, a custom of the prophets, when the strong has fallen, to exhort the weaker to fear and lamentation, and in this way to express the thought that there now remains no deliverance for the latter, comp. on chap. 9 : 5. — אֲשֶׁר is taken by several in the sense *because*, and it cannot indeed be denied, that *what* sometimes expresses the sense of *because*, comp. Gesenius, *Thes.* s. v. Ewald, p. 661. But still there is here no reason for the assumption of this peculiarity, which scarcely occurs, except in historical prose, which is more inaccurate, and approaches nearer to the language of common life. On the contrary, we should then expect the article in אַדִּירִים. The phrase, "*which* are magnificent," expresses either the ground, why in general the cedars are named, and the cypresses on account of their fall exhorted to lamentation; — the cedar is the queen of the forest; "does this happen in the green wood, what will be in the dry?" comp. Ezek. 21 : 3, "Behold I kindle in thee a fire, and it consumes in thee every green tree and every dry tree." — Or it refers to a difference among the cedars themselves; the cedar forest on Lebanon consists even now of two kinds of trees, the high and majestic ancient trees, in Jeremiah l. c. called "the choice of his cedars," and those of a more recent growth. Comp. Ritter. *Erdkunde*, II. p. 445 sq. Accordingly, the words contain a climax; even the most splendid cedars have fallen, how then can the rest of the forest expect to be spared? The latter sense, on account of the parallel passage of Jeremiah, is certainly to be preferred. The defenders of the allegorical interpretation have ever found in these words a direct confirmation of their view. The Seventy translate: ὅτι μεγάλως μεγιστᾶνες ἐταλαιπώρησαν. Jerome: "*quoniam magnifici vastati sunt*," on which he remarks: "*Quodque prius dixit obscure, nunc ponit manifestius. — Cupio scire, quæ sint cedri Libani, quæ combustæ sunt, quæ abietes,*

quibus ululatus indicitur, quæ pinus, quæ corruit; magnifici, inquit, vastati sunt." Theodoret: *Καὶ ἑρμηνεύων, ἃ τροπικῶς εἴρηκεν ἐπήγαγεν κ. τ. λ.* Cyril: "*Ὅτι δὲ περὶ ἀνθρώπων ὁ λόγος ἀταλαίπωρον ἰδεῖν· ἔφη γὰρ εὐθὺς, ὅτι μεγάλως μεγιστᾶνες ἐταλαιπώρησαν.* Among the moderns with peculiar confidence Hitzig l. c. p. 33. But there is not the smallest ground for this supposition. אַדִּיר is used not only in general of lifeless things, comp. e. g. Exod. 15: 10, Ps. 93: 5, but it also occurs especially as an epithet of the cedar, Ezek. 17: 23, corresponding to "the high and the exalted." Is. 2: 13. יָרַד stands in a poetic discourse to express the prostration of the forest also in Is. 32: 19. — Its high and lofty trees come down as it were from the throne to the dust. — In the last words the marginal reading יַעַר הַבָּצִיר is probably to be preferred, as the more difficult, to that of the text יַעַר הַבָּצוֹר. It appears, that the prophet in these words designed a double sense, and therefore chose as well the unusual combination, "the forest of the strong," for "the strong forest," as also the unusual form, which does not elsewhere occur, בָּצִיר for בָּצוֹר, in the sense *inaccessible, strong*. יַעַר הַבָּצִיר may signify both the forest of extinction, and the forest to be destroyed. בָּצִיר has throughout the sense *vintage*. The vintage, however, is a frequent image of extinction and destruction. Thus, Judges 8: 2, "Is not the gleaning of Ephraim, better than the vintage of Abiezer. Obad. v. 5, "Had the vintagers passed over thee, would they not have left a gleaning?" Particularly however, Jer. 6: 9, "The remnant which is left of Israel, they will gather as a vine; cast (O friend) as a vintager one after another into the vats," and chap. 49: 9, "If vintagers (בֹּצְרִים) had passed over thee, would they not have left a gleaning?" The prophet accordingly would embrace in one and the same word the present and future condition of Lebanon. Entirely analogous is Is. 13: 22, "the jackals answer each other," בְּאַלְמְנוֹתָיו. That the prophet has here, without any particular reason, chosen the form which elsewhere never occurs, אַרְמְנוֹתָיו for אַלְמְנוֹתָיו, *his palaces*, we certainly cannot, with Gesenius and Winer, assume. He rather thereby points out, that the proud palaces of luxury should at a future period be *widowed*. Such an allusion is the more admissable in Zechariah, as in general among the later prophets the play upon words and the allusion had become much more frequent. Thus e. g. Jer. 19: 2, the name of the *fragment-door* is mentioned plainly in reference to the impending destruction, as appears from a comparison of v. 11; see also on chap. 6: 9 – 15.

V. 3. "*The sound of the howl of the shepherds; for laid waste is their ornament, the sound of the roaring of the lions; for laid waste is the pride of the Jordan.*" The prophet describes what he perceives in inward vision, and hence the absence of the verb is explained, and there is no occasion to assume an ellipsis. An exactly parallel passage is found in Jer. 25 : 34 sq. There can indeed be no doubt, that Zechariah had it in view. In Jeremiah, also, the invasion of an enemy from the North is described. The only difference is, that here again, that which is metaphorical with Jeremiah, is individualization with Zechariah. Particularly v. 36, agrees almost *verbatim* with the first half of the verse before us: קוֹל צְעָקַת הָרֹעִים וְיִלֲלַת אַדִּירֵי הַצֹּאן כִּי־שֹׁדֵד יְהוָה אֶת־מִרְעִיתָם, "The voice of the cry of the shepherds and of the howl of the excellent of the flock; for the Lord lays waste their pasturage." With the second member v. 38 coincides. "They leave, as a lion, their resting-place, for their land is for desolation." Peculiar to Zechariah only is the circumstance, that the lions especially are frightened from *the pride of Jordan*, the stately shrubbery, which covers its banks, so that its waters cannot be obtained, until a path has been made through it, and which serves as an abode for innumerable wild beasts, though now no longer for the lions, (comp. Burkhardt, II. p. 593, Ritter, II. 324, Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* II. 1, p. 196 ff.) But on a nearer examination, it appears that this trait also is taken from other passages of Jeremiah. Not only do we find the designation, *the pride of Jordan*, of which Schnurrer (on Jer. 12, in Velthausen, Kuinoel, and Ruperti, *Comm. Theol.* III. p. 372,) erroneously asserts, that it was gradually introduced into the language of the people, as a proper geographical appellation, since it never occurs as such, but always with respect to its appellative meaning as an honorable epithet, in three passages of Jeremiah, and in him alone; but also in all these three passages the *pride of Jordan* is designated especially as an abode of lions, which it certainly first became, when the land by the desolating wars towards the end of the Jewish state, was more and more depopulated, (comp. 2 Kings 17.) At the time to which the second part of Zechariah has been recently assigned, it had not yet become so. And, besides, this idiom is so far from being peculiar, that we could explain the recurrence of it in Zechariah merely from his having used Jeremiah. Jer. 49 : 19, it is said, in the prophecy against Edom: "Behold, as a lion will he go up from the *pride of Jordan* to the fold of the strong," ("*terram Edom, qui se fortem*

et invictum jactat." Schmid). It occurs also *verbatim* 50 : 45, in the prophecy against Babylon. Chap. 12 : 5, "In the land of peace dost thou confide, but what wilt thou do in *the pride of the Jordan*," a secure region is contrasted with the environs of the Jordan, dangerous on account of lions. When we consider such instances, we cannot sufficiently wonder at the blindness of those, who assign the second part of Zechariah to the period before the exile, a view which gives rise to such *monstra interpretationis* as the before mentioned treatise of Hitzig. — The *ornament of the shepherds*, according to a comparison of the parallel passages of Jeremiah, are the excellent pastures, not indeed, as Rosenmüller supposes, the trees, which afforded them shade. What the prophet here expresses by way of individualization, the thought, that each one loses that which is his pride, his joy, the desire of his eyes, the love of his soul, Ezekiel, 33 : 28, embraces in the general proposition; "I make the land a waste, its mighty pride is extinct, the mountains of Israel are made desolate, so that no man passes through." The howling shepherds and the roaring lions, frightened from their lairs, are the representatives of all in the land, who have any good to be lost.

V. 4. Flügge and Rosenmüller altogether erroneously assume, that a new prophecy commences here. V. 1 – 3, are rather to be regarded only as a sort of prelude; after the prophet has there painted the judgment, which should come upon the covenant people, he here exhibits the causes, which had brought it upon them. Calvin: "*Hic subjicitur ratio, cur deus tam severe agere cogitet cum populo suo, nempe quoniam eorum obstinatio nihil veniæ meretur. — Præcipue ingratitudinis accusat Judæos, quod tam male et indigne responderunt singularibus dei beneficiis.*" V. 1 – 3 are related to the rest of the chapter in nearly the same manner as Is. 52 : 13 – 15 to chap. 53. — "*Thus saith the Lord my God: Feed the flock of slaughter.*" The question here arises in the first place, who is the person addressed, who it is that receives the command to feed the flock. 1. Many interpreters, as Frischmuth, Mark, Michaelis, Sack (Apologetik, p. 303), and others, suppose him to be, without any participation of the prophet, the angel of the Lord united with God by a unity of being, or the Messiah; because this angel, according to the doctrine of the Old Testament, was to appear in him. That the assumption is unnatural, that a person should be introduced, as acting so suddenly, without any further description, is not sufficient to refute this view. The unexpected introduction of new per-

sons, who are made known merely by their discourse and actions, has in its favor numerous analogies in the prophetic writings, and is a necessary consequence of the dramatic character of the prophetic discourse. But the sudden appearance of the angel of the Lord, is here the less liable to objection, since in the first part he is uniformly reckoned among the acting persons. But the comparison of v. 15 sq., is of itself a complete refutation of this view. The person, who there comes forward and acts, must necessarily be identical with the subject of v. 4 sq. This is shown by, "Take to thee again the implements of the foolish shepherd." The עוֹד proves, beyond dispute, that he, who here takes the implements of the evil shepherd, is identical with him, who, according to v. 7 sq., carries the implements of the good shepherd. But the contents of v. 15 sq., as the defenders of this view must themselves confess, are in no way suited to the angel of the Lord, or to the Messiah. Consequently also, in v. 4 sq., he alone cannot be the subject. 2. Others suppose, that the person addressed is the prophet, not as the representative of another, but in his own proper person. This supposition is so absurd, that it scarcely needs a refutation. It is contradicted by v. 15 sq., in like manner as the foregoing. If the prophet there comes forward not in his own person, but as a representative of another, such also must be the case here. To this we may add the comparison of the parallel passages, especially Ezek. chap. 37. The evil shepherds, according to this prophecy, shall be deprived of their office. The Lord himself will now take charge of his flock, search after his scattered sheep, bring them back to their pastures in the land of Israel, and there feed them. He will raise up for them (v. 23) one sole shepherd, his servant David, who will feed them, and be their shepherd. Comp. also Jer. 23. Is it now conceivable, that the great work, which is there attributed to the Lord and the Messiah, would here be assigned to the prophet and exercised by him, a feeble servant of the Lord in the new and poor colony? How could he possibly be the chief shepherd of the whole flock, v. 7, who deposes all other shepherds, or leaders of the people, v. 8, who would afford the people security against all foreign nations and preserve them in harmony, and at whose powerful word both should cease? What sense has the relation concerning the thirty pieces of silver, when referred to the prophet? Rosenmüller has endeavoured to obviate a part of these difficulties, by appealing to the custom of the prophets, to attribute that to themselves as an action, which they pre-

dict as future. "Feed the flock destined for the slaughter," he explains, after the Chaldee, by "*vaticinare de ovibus mactationi a malis suis pastoribus destinatis.*" But this supposition appears on a nearer examination altogether untenable. That the prophets often attribute to themselves as an action, that which they only predict, is by no means owing to the circumstance, that all active verbs may have at the same time a declarative meaning (an absurd supposition), but to the fact that the consciousness of the Spirit working in them, who at the same time gave the prophecy and accomplished the fulfilment, suppressed the consciousness of their own personality; that they often spoke, not as individuals, but as mere organs of God. Hence it follows, that the prophets express as their own action, not that in general which is future, but only what the Lord will accomplish in the future. This is confirmed by a view of all the passages relating to the subject. If we apply this usage here, it is impossible that v. 4 can have the sense assumed by Rosenmüller; it must rather be explained, "Announce, that the Lord will feed," and in like manner also must all the following active verbs employed by the prophet be understood. This however is obviously inadmissible. How, e. g. can we translate v. 7: "So then I predicted that the Lord would feed the herd, destined for slaughter, that he would take two staves, the one kindness and the other grace, that he would destroy the three shepherds in one month"? There is not a single example to be found of such a mode of representation continued through an entire and long portion; whenever it occurs, it is interchanged with the other, more usual, in which the prophet is distinguished from God, who works in him. 3. There remains, therefore, only the view, that with v. 4 the relation of a symbolical action commences, in which the prophet represents another person, and typifies his future actions and fate. That this is customary in the symbolical actions of the prophets, every one of them proves. Thus e. g. Isaiah, chap. 20, typifies the future fate of the Egyptians and Ethiopians. So Jeremiah, chap. 20, and Ezekiel, chap. 4, the circumstances of the covenant people. In the symbolical action, which is related in the first three chapters of Hosea, the prophet represents the Lord, and typifies in his actions his future conduct towards the covenant people. In determining the person represented by the prophet in the present instance, the choice lies only between the Lord and his angel or his revealer. In favor of the latter we cannot argue, that the Lord is several times, as v. 4 – 13, distinguished from the subject of discourse; this dis-

tinction belongs, as the comparison of Hosea shows, to the nature of the symbolic action; it refers not to the subject, but to the drapery; the person represented commands him, who makes the representation, what he must do in order that the representation may correspond to the subject. Just as little, however, can we appeal in favor of the first to the fact, that, v. 13, Jehovah calls the base reward which had been given to the shepherd, the splendid price which had been paid to himself, the Lord. As the angel of the Lord, united with him by a unity of being, is throughout the Scriptures at one time distinguished from him, as the person sent, from him who sends, at another shares in his name, and in his actions, (comp. Vol. I. p. 164,) so also in Zechariah. The most remarkable example is chap. 2 : 12, 13, "Thus saith *Jehovah of Hosts:* after the glory (rightly Jonathan: "*Post gloriam, quæ promissa est, ut adducatur super vos*") he has sent me to the heathen who rob you; for he that touches you, touches the apple of *his* eye. For behold, I brandish my hand against them, and they become for a prey to them whom they served. And he shall know that Jehovah of Hosts hath sent me." The person speaking here, distinguishes himself from Jehovah of Hosts, who has sent him, but the prophet nevertheless gives him the name of Jehovah of Hosts, and he attributes to himself a divine work, the destruction of the enemies of the covenant people. Comp. above, p. 24. — The decision depends rather on the result furnished by the collective contents of the predictions of the prophet respecting the relation of the Lord and his angel to the covenant people. But here it is soon perceived, that all relations of the Lord to his people are conducted through the mediation of his revealer, endowed with the entire fulness of his omnipotence, that all blessings to be imparted to them proceed from him, that he is the proper protecting and covenant God of the Israelites. It is he, who, chap. 1 : 8, accompanied by a host of angels, is present in the valley of myrtle-bushes, the symbol of the covenant people, who, chap. 2 : 14, promises to dwell in the midst of them, who, chap. 3 : 1 sq., rebukes the complaint of Satan against the covenant people, in the person of their representative Joshua, and out of his own full power imparts to him the forgiveness of sins. To whom, but to him, the constant shepherd of the people, could the last and greatest attempt described in this portion, to prove his pastoral fidelity towards them, be attributed? This result, thus independently obtained, is still confirmed by the fact, that we meet again with the reward of thirty

pieces of silver in the history of the angel of the Lord, manifested in the Messiah, and that he is designated in the New Testament as the subject of the prophet's representation. — Whether the symbolical action here described took place inwardly or outwardly we scarcely need to inquire, since the former, as Maimonides has already shown, (Mor. Neb. 2 : 46, Buxt. p. 324,) is so very obvious. The guarding of the flock of slaughter, the destruction of their three shepherds, the imparting of the reward of thirty pieces of silver, — all this cannot have taken place outwardly, the less so, since the subject matter often appears behind the symbol, as e. g. v. 11, where the miserable sheep are spoken of, who adhered to the great high shepherd, and who observed that it was the word of the Lord, and v. 12, where the prophet treats with the flock itself concerning the reward; both which are inexplicable, if the prophet fed a literal flock of sheep. The supposition, moreover, that the symbolic action was internal, is favored by the analogy of the visions of the first part, which differ from it only in this, that here the prophet himself comes forward as the chief actor in the scene, while there he mostly coöperates only so far, (comp. nevertheless, chap. 3, p. 32,) as the disclosures respecting the import of the symbolic representations are imparted to him. But in general the symbolic actions in the prophets, who appeared after the connexion with the Chaldees, viz. Ezekiel and Daniel, are almost uniformly internal, which was owing to a participation in the exceedingly rich Chaldee-Babylonish imagination. — With respect to the import of the symbolic action, those interpreters are at once to be rejected, who find here references to events before the exile. These, particularly the invention of several Jews from controversial zeal against the Christians, (comp. the passages in Abicht, in the valuable treatise *De Baculis Jucunditatis et Corrumpentium*, in the *Thesaur. Nov.* I. p. 1094 sq.) are so arbitrary and absurd, that they deserve not even to be mentioned, much less refuted. That which is alleged in their favor, the use of the præters, loses all show of argument, as soon as it has been proved that the prophet here describes a symbolic action. For this had actually already taken place, while the thing typified by it was still future. If, however, the reference to the time of the second temple is established, the choice can lie only between two interpretations, the one which finds here typified the whole condition of God towards the covenant people under the second temple; the other, which regards the symbolic representation as a type of one particular effort under

the second temple to rescue the people, who were near destruction, viz. the pastoral office of Christ, and the rejection of the people as the consequence of their rejection of him. The former view was adopted by Abarbanel, whose words we must cite, because they show, how the power of truth, at least more with him than with the other Jewish interpreters, gained the victory over doctrinal prejudice and caused him to apprehend at least the fundamental thought of the prophecy. He says, according to the translation of Abicht: "*Sensus prophetæ is est. Postquam deus prophetæ indicasset bona, quæ erant futura super incolas secundi templi, si vias suas bonas redderent, secundum prophetias quas jam interpretatus sum, pergit sermo ad prophetam, ipsi significando futura, si non bona redderent opera et se bonis illis dignos exhiberent, sed si e contrario reges et sacerdotes eorum una cum reliquo populo deterius viverent, quam patres eorum, quomodo non sufficiebat, ut operibus bonis Schechinam et revelationem non reducerent, sed quoque se reos redderent desolationum et captivitatis. Et huc tendit sapientum p. m. in principio capitis: Aperi, Libanon, portas tuas.*" (Comp. on v. 1.) This view is also taken by Calvin. According to him, the Lord executes the pastoral office through all his true servants, under the second temple, most completely through Christ. "*Suscipit propheta in se personam omnium pastorum; quasi diceret: non esse cur obtendat populus inscitiam, vel culpam suam aliis titulis et coloribus fucare velit; quia deus semper obtulit se pastorem, et adhibuit etiam ministros, quorum manu regeret populum hunc. Non stetit igitur per deum, quin feliciter haberi potuerit hic populus.*" A copious defence of this reference is given by Abicht, (l. c. p. 1092 sq.) His chief argument is the following: "*In antecedentibus propheta habitatoribus templi secundi dei specialem providentiam et defensionem contra insultantes hostes, terræ fertilitatem, c.* 10: 1, *defensionem et robur,* 3 – 7, *multiplicationem et collectionem,* 8 *sqq., promisit, quæ omnia ad templi secundi tempora respiciunt. Quoniam vero deus prævidit, quod in bono non perstituri, sed malis operibus contaminati, pœnam meriturі sint, nunc bonorum promissioni pœnam adjungit, quæ eos mansura sit, si a legis divinæ tramite deflecterent. — His rationibus subnixus dico, nostra verba de modo Judæos in templo secundo pascendi in genere loqui, quo deus modo bonos, modo malos concessit pastores, prout Judæorum vita et opera comparata fuerunt.*" Sack also is inclined to refer the prophecy to the execution of the pastoral office by the angel of the Lord during the whole time of the second tem-

ple, but still with a predominant reference throughout to Christ. — On the other hand, the exclusive reference to the pastoral office to be discharged by Christ is so plainly to be regarded as the prevailing one, that it would be useless labor to mention its individual defenders. If now we examine the grounds for the former view, it will readily appear, that that advanced by Abicht has no force. For from the fact, that the prophecy, chap. 9 and 10, concerning the favors to be conferred upon the Jews by the victories of Alexander, embraces the whole time of the second temple, until the coming of Christ, how could it follow that the prophecy before us is equally comprehensive, that it does not rather give prominence to the *chief object* of the foregoing prophecy, the appearing of Christ, (not only does he distinctly appear, chap. 9 : 9, 10, but elsewhere also, as we have seen, there are representations of the Messianic time,) and represent it in another point of view, in order that it may appear in its full and true character, and not exert a pernicious instead of a wholesome influence, by being partially and carnally apprehended? An appeal might still be made to Jer. 23 : 4, where the Lord promises, that he will give the people good *shepherds*, in the place of their present bad ones; and to Ezek. chap. 34, where, in like manner, the assumption of the pastoral office by the Lord, refers to the whole period from the return from Babylon till the appearing of Christ. But in these prophecies also, which Zechariah plainly had in view, the sending of the Messiah is made particularly prominent, as the highest and most complete manifestation of the pastoral fidelity of the Lord. He will raise up for them, according to Ezek. v. 23, one sole shepherd, who shall feed them, his servant David; he will feed them, and he will be their shepherd. He, the Lord, will be their God, and his servant David will be a prince in the midst of them. According to Jer. v. 5, he will raise up to David a righteous branch, who shall be a king and reign well, and establish justice and righteousness on earth. Wherefore now should not Zechariah, having these prophecies in view, render prominent alone the highest and last manifestation of the pastoral fidelity of the Lord; especially as its inferior manifestations, promised both by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, through the restoration from exile and the excellent leaders of the new colony, Zerubbabel and Joshua, who are extolled by Zechariah in the first part, already belonged chiefly to the past? This view, therefore, has no plausible ground in its favor, on the contrary it is liable to one entirely decisive objection.

According to this interpretation, the pastoral office of the Lord, and therefore also the destruction of the three shepherds in v. 8, must be something extending through the centuries from the return from the exile, until the extinction of the Theocracy. On the contrary, however, it is said, v. 8, "I destroyed the three shepherds *in one month.*" We have here a clear explanation of the prophet, that his symbolic action typifies one single act of the pastoral fidelity of the Lord, to be completed in a comparatively short time. In addition to this, the designation of the covenant people as a flock of slaughter, agrees well with the condition of the people at the time of the appearance of Christ, but not during the whole second-temple, and, least of all, at the time of the prophet. The latter is indeed asserted by Calvin: "*Grex occisionis refertur ad prophetæ ætatem; mortuæ oves, quas dominus eripuerat, multis molestiis adhuc expositæ erant.*" But, if we compare the representation of v. 5, it soon appears that the condition of the people here represented is entirely different from that after the exile, which was indeed poor, but peaceful. — Finally the breaking also of the staff, Grace, signifying the withdrawal of the protection which the Lord granted his people against the heathen nations, and the breaking of the staff of the covenanted, signifying the termination of harmony among the people themselves, appear here altogether as one particular action of lasting consequences; comp. v. 11, "and it was broken in that day." The Lord gives up the people, not as in their former history, to transient punishment, in order to receive them again into favor when they shall have turned to him, but the peremptory decree of rejection is pronounced against them. And yet we should expect the former, if the representation relates to the whole proceeding of the Lord with the covenant people during the second temple. If, however, the rejection is an individual act, so also must the conduct of the people by which it is occasioned, be the last and highest manifestation of their refractory spirit, as it appeared in the rejection of Christ. As such, it plainly appears from the comparison of v. 4 and 6: "Feed the flock of slaughter, —*for* I will no more spare the dwellers in the land, saith the Lord." Here the feeding is designated as the *last* effort for the deliverance of the unhappy people, to be *immediately* followed by their total rejection, if, as actually happened, that effort should fail. — A diversity in the interpretation of צֹאן הַהֲרֵגָה is still to be mentioned. The *flock of slaughter* can signify a flock which has been already slaughtered, or one which is to be so at a future time. The

Lord can thus name the covenant people in order to give, as the ground of his pastoral office, his sympathy with their miserable condition before he undertook this office, or his sympathy with them on account of the judgments still to be inflicted through his righteousness. It is best however to combine them both. The present miserable condition of the people under evil rulers, both domestic and foreign, was an effect of the divine justice. This should and must continue for the future, and be increased, if the people did not sincerely repent; and, in order to furnish them with the means for this, the Lord himself undertakes the office of a shepherd, and comes to deliver that which is lost.

V. 5. "*Whose buyers slay them, and do not become guilty, and whose sellers say: The Lord be praised, I enrich myself; and their shepherds spare them not.*" The futures of the verse are to be taken as a designation of an action already indeed commenced, but still in progress. The use of them of itself shows, that the designation of the Israelites, as a flock of slaughter, cannot be referred solely to the past and present. לֹא יֶאְשָׁמוּ is translated by several interpreters, "They are not punished"; by others, "They feel themselves not guilty" (Calvin: "*Non sunt sibi conscii crudelitatis*"); others still unite both, as Michaelis: "*Impune hoc faciunt, ac ne culpam quidem ullam, dum oves occidunt, agnoscunt.*" Mark: "They are not guilty in their own eyes," "*Vel tandem etiam apud judicem humanum et divinum, quo pœnam non poscente hoc agant impune.*" In like manner also, *Praised be the Lord, I enrich myself*, is taken by all interpreters merely as a designation of the highest cruelty, and obduracy on the part of the sellers. So Grotius: "*Nihil plebem curo, dum ego ex sacerdotio magnos quæstus faciam.*" Michaelis: "*Adeo non agnoscunt se reos, ut sibi in corde benedicant, et deum ipsum velut auctorem opum injuste partarum laudent.*" But this interpretation is decidedly wrong. יֶאְשָׁמוּ can mean neither, "They do not acknowledge themselves as guilty," nor "They are not punished." This verb אָשַׁם has indeed, as all verbs which signify transgression, the accessary idea of the punishment of sin, but the main idea of guiltiness is never lost. It is still more evident from a comparison of the parallel passages, that this interpretation is inadmissible. These show, that the prophet would express the thought, that the misery of the people does not proceed from human caprice, but from the righteous judgment of God. Jer. 2: 3, is especially to the point, "Sacred was Israel to the Lord, the first-fruits of his increase. All

who destroyed it were guilty, misfortune came upon them, saith the Lord." (Jonathan: "*Et sicut, qui edit de primitiis messis manipuli oblationis, antequam inde offerant sacerdotes filii Aharonis oblationes super altari, reus fit, sic omnes qui deprædabantur domum Israelis, reatum sibi contrahebant.*") The prophet here contrasts the former time, when no one could injure the theocratically disposed people, without making himself guilty and liable to punishment, with the present, when they are given up by the Lord himself to their enemies, as his instruments, and become their *lawful* booty. In like manner, chap. 50: 6, 7; "Perishing sheep are my people; their shepherds lead them astray; they cause them to wander about on the mountains, they go from mountain to hill, forgetful of their fold. All who find them consume them, and their enemies say; We make not ourselves guilty (לֹא נֶאְשָׁם), because they have sinned against the Lord, the dwelling-place of righteousness, against the Lord, the hope of their fathers." Here, as the cause of the innocence of the enemies, the apostasy of the people from their God is expressly given, which brought upon them the tyranny of their enemies as a righteous divine judgment. The passage, chap. 25: 9, although probably not so distinctly regarded by the prophet as the two foregoing, yet deserves to be cited; "Behold, I send and take all the nations of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, *my servant*, and upon this land and upon all these people round about, and I *put them under a curse*, and make them desolate," &c. Nebuchadnezzar appears here as the minister of the divine justice, who, if this destination had been the motive of his action, could have executed its decisions against the covenant people without guilt, as in chap. 22: 7, ("I sanctify against thee destroyers,") the war against them is represented as sacred. — "Their sellers say," is, *as to the sense*, i. q., "they can say." It is very frequent to attribute that to any one as a saying, which, from the nature of the case, he could say. Still the comparison of Is. 36: 10, where Sennacherib says: "Have I invaded this land in order to destroy it, without the Lord? Yea, the Lord said to me, Invade this land and destroy it," shows, that the enemies of the Israelites sometimes actually had a presentiment of their higher destination. — That is a lawful gain, in respect to which one can say, *Blessed or praised be God*, for the imparting of which a man can thank the Lord. Appropriately Calvin, although with another application: "*Solemus gratias agere deo, ubi quæ nobis obveniunt bona, possimus ei accepta ferre. Non dicet latro, qui jugulavit innoxium: Benedic-*

tus sit deus ; nam vellet exstinctum esse dei nomen potius, quia vulnerat ejus conscientiam." — קֹנֵיהֶן, as the antithesis to מֹכְרֵיהֶן, shows, (comp. Is. 24 : 2,) not, as several interpret it, "their possessors," but *their sellers.* By the *buyers* and *sellers* of the flock are designated here those, who dealt with and ruled the covenant people according to their pleasure. We can by no means, with Theodoret, Cyril, and others, refer this to the evil leaders of the people from among themselves, but rather to their foreign oppressors, as Jerome has rightly understood, by the buyers and sellers, the Romans. This plainly appears from the cited parallel passages, still more, however, from the thing itself; how could the flock, Israel, be a lawful gain to their domestic shepherds? for these were themselves a chief cause of their apostasy, and were therefore chiefly subject to the punishment, comp. v. 17, Jer. 23 : 1. Jahn deserves not to be refuted, when, from the form *Praised be the Lord,* he concludes : "*Hebræos esse hos venditores, uti in bello cum Romanis erant.*" On the contrary, by "the shepherds who spare not the flock," it is highly probable, that the domestic leaders of the people, and indeed these exclusively, are to be understood, as appears from the comparison of v. 8, as well as of v. 15 – 17. The former passage at the same time decisively proves, that, by the shepherds, not merely the civil leaders, as Abarbanel and Grotius suppose, are to be understood, but likewise the ecclesiastical, and, in general, those who had in any way been called by the Lord to the guidance of the people. There is therefore a climax ; the people sigh, and will sigh, not only under the oppression of foreign tyrants, but even their own leaders deal unsparingly with them. The apparently feeble expression, "they spare not," when used of the native shepherds, is stronger than any other merely positive designation of their conduct, because it expresses how nature and duty required them to spare their own flock, and, therefore, how it was a severe divine judgment when they denied them both. — Something must still be remarked respecting an apparent grammatical anomaly. The plural, *the sellers* and *the shepherds,* is joined with the singular of the verb. This cannot possibly be accidental, as even Ewald, p. 644, seems to suppose. Even the remaining examples cited by him, which he regards as pure errors, might be referred to one cause, and here the twofold repetition is the more inconsistent with the idea of a mere mistake or inaccuracy. The prophet would point out, that, notwithstanding the apparent plurality of the actors, there is yet properly but one principal, that it

is the Lord who works by the sellers and the shepherds. That the buyers and the sellers are represented as instruments of the Lord, we have already seen; in respect to the shepherds, the expression, "for I will not spare," at the beginning of v. 6, is particularly to be observed, whereby the Lord plainly indicates himself, as the reason of the shepherds not sparing the flock. To this must still be added, v. 16, "for, behold, I raise up a shepherd in the land." In a later prophet, like Zechariah, such a phenomenon is the less surprising.

V. 6. "*I will no longer spare the inhabitants of the land, saith the Lord, and I will give one into the power of the other, and into the power of his king; and they lay waste the land, and I will not deliver out of their hand.*" The כִּי at the beginning can be referred to v. 5. The *futures* of this verse would then be taken in the sense of the future, and by *the flock of slaughter* must accordingly be understood, one which should be slaughtered, not one which had already begun to be slaughtered. For in this verse the reason would then be given, why the people, in case they rejected the last effort for their deliverance, should be given over to destruction without their destroyers involving themselves in guilt. The Lord, having long waited for the fruit of the barren tree, must finally cut it down. But as the flock, v. 7, is described as one already miserable at the time when the Lord entered upon his pastoral office, it is unreasonable to limit v. 4, 5, to the future. It is better, therefore, to refer the כִּי to the expression, *Feed the flock of slaughter.* "Make the last effort to conduct them to prosperity; for I cannot and must not longer suffer their shocking apostasy to go unpunished." הָאָרֶץ *the land*, that, which had been the subject of discourse in the preceding context, the land of Israel. Jerome: "*De hac enim terra loquitur, de qua ei sermo erat, et non de orbe terrarum, sicut Judæi male interpretantes a se volunt in aliam partem depravare dei sententiam.*" The explanation of this verse also depends upon the comparison of a parallel passage of Jer. 19: 9, made use of by the prophet; "And I make them eat the flesh of their sons, and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat one the flesh of the other, (וְאִישׁ בְּשַׂר־רֵעֵהוּ יֹאכֵלוּ) in the anguish and distress wherewith their enemies shall oppress them, and those who endeavour to take their life." A twofold reason of the destruction, a twofold punishment sent by the Lord, is here given, the discord of the people among themselves, heightened by the distress and the oppressions of the

enemy. It is entirely the same here also; the former is indicated by, "I give them one to the other," the second by, "I give them a prey to their king." For that we are not to understand by the king a domestic ruler, but rather a foreign oppressor, appears from the fact, that neither had the covenant people, at the time of the prophet, a domestic king, nor has he made mention of any such, the Messiah excepted, in his description of the future. Internal discord and external enemies are combined as the two chief instruments of punishment, which God employs for the discipline of his people, not only in the cited passages of Jeremiah and Is. 9 : 7 sq., comp. especially v. 18, 19, and 3 : 4, but also by Zechariah himself, chap. 8 : 10, "Before these days, — there was no peace before the enemies, and I sent all men one against the other," (אִישׁ בְּרֵעֵהוּ.) This miserable condition of the people, at the time of the carrying away into exile, is then designated here as returning in greater measure on account of their guilty ingratitude for renewed mercies and their apostasy. If we look to the fulfilment, it easily appears that the Roman Cæsar is here designated by the king; comp. John 19 : 15, where the Jews say, "We have no king but Cæsar." How accurately this prophecy agrees with the fate of the Jews after the rejection of Christ, the frightful rage of the parties against one another, until at last the city was taken by the Romans, need not be pointed out, and is confirmed by the well known passages from Josephus, which Jahn has supplied with a liberal hand. — The *verb* מָצָא in Hiph., "to cause any one to be found or find himself"; then, "to deliver any one into the hand," for "to deliver up." As the subject of כִּתְּתוּ, properly *contundunt*, we can supply the nearest relation and the king. So Michaelis: "*Misere affligent et vastabunt, tum internis collisionibus, tum extranea hostilitate.*" It is, however, more suitable to regard the king alone as the subject. For it appears that the words, *and they lay waste the land*, only form a compendium of the description of the hostile invasion in v. 1 – 3. The verb כָּתַת agrees better with a hostile invasion than an internal discord.

V. 7. "*So fed I then the flock of slaughter, out of sympathy with their misery; and I made me two staves, the one I named Grace, the other I named the Allied, and I fed the flock.*" Of the words לָכֵן עֲנִיֵּי הַצֹּאן, we give first the explanation which appears to us as without doubt the true one, and then we examine those which deviate from it. We translate: *therefore, the most miserable of the sheep.* These words give as the ground of the pastoral office, undertaken by

the Lord, his sympathy with the misery of the flock, entirely coinciding with v. 4 and 6, "Feed the flock of slaughter; *for* I will not further spare," &c. לָכֵן we take in its usual meaning *therefore*. We find no grammatical ellipsis, but only a concise form of expression, which occurs as a result of passion in every kind of discourse, and with especial frequency in the prophets. It is peculiar to passion to speak in abrupt and broken sentences, barely sufficient to call forth the same feeling or thought in the soul of the hearer or reader. The sentence, when completed, would read: "I did this because they were the most miserable sheep." We cite only a few examples of a similar concise method of expressing passion. Zechariah himself furnishes us with three in chap. 4: 6, 7. The most striking is v. 7, "Zerubbabel brings forth the foundation stone; acclamations; grace, grace to it." *Acclamations* תְּשֻׁאוֹת stands here without any necessity of supposing a grammatical ellipsis, instead of a whole sentence; "acclamations are thereupon heard or uttered." We have a similar example in the same verse: "Who art thou, O mountain, thou great before Zerubbabel? To a plain," for "Thou shalt become a plain;" and v. 6; "Not by power and not by strength, but by my Spirit," viz. are the affairs of the Theocracy, in general, and especially the building of the temple, accomplished. We refer also to Is. 44: 12, where, in the representation of idolatry, which is in the highest degree passionate and concise, it is said, "the smith the axe," (חָרַשׁ בַּרְזֶל מַעֲצָד,) as to the sense certainly i. q. "the smith prepares the axe," though the assumption of a pure grammatical ellipsis of the verb, here and elsewhere, could by no means be justified. The mere mention of the subject and object is sufficient to awaken in the reader the conception analogous to that of the author. As there indignation at the folly of idolatry is the passion which the concise expression excites, — comp. the almost still more remarkable example 66: 18, "I, your works," — so here it is the tenderest love of the Lord towards his people, and grief over their misery. That grief, in particular, loves abruptness, is well known. — Among the interpretations which differ from ours, the first class consists of those which take לָכֵן as a particle, but in an unusual sense. Among these, those come nearest the truth, who, as Abenezra, ("לָכֵן *idem, quod* בָּעֲבוּר"); Tarnov, ("*propterea, quod essent miseri gregis,*") and Noldius (*Conc. Part.* p. 507), give to לָכֵן the meaning *because*. They have hit the sense, but have misunderstood the grammar. Those wander further, who, with Castalio, De Dieu, Drusius, Storr,

Rosenmuller, understand לָכֵן as a particle of asseveration. All these and other explanations are set aside by the simple remark, that לָכֵן never means any thing else than, *for this reason, therefore.* Even the meaning *verumtamen, attamen,* assumed by Winer, rests only on a superficial view of the passages cited by him. Hos. 2: 16, Jer. 16: 14, 30: 16, Ezek. 39: 25, "*in quibus omnibus,*" as he says, "*subito transitur a comminationibus ad pœnas.*" In Jer. 16, the promise in itself considered is out of place, as the threatening is immediately afterwards continued. The true interpretation is already given by Seb. Schmid, perhaps the best commentator on Jeremiah, either ancient or modern: "*Est quidem promissio liberationis, sed ita ut primo hoc faciat ad exaggerandam diuturnitatem et gravitatem captivitatis, ex qua si emerserint suo tempore Judæi, putabunt se ex majori malo emersisse, quam patres in Ægypto.*" Chap. 30: 16, no threatening has preceded, but only a justification of the divine judgment, which had already been executed. This had been inflicted by God with a paternal disposition, as Israel would learn from the result itself. In Ezekiel the heathen shall know that the Lord has given Israel into their power; for this reason will he now deliver them. In Hosea the demonstration of love has the same object as the punishment before predicted. — A second class consists of those who take לָכֵן, not as a particle, but as a *pron. gen. fœm.*, after the Masorites, who designate it as לשון נקבה, and Jarchi. So Michaelis: "*Propter vos, o miseri gregis. — Nisi scivissem me in populo Judaico habere obsequiosas aliquot, licet pauciores, et a potiori turba contemtas oves, quæ vocem pastoris auditurœ essent, nec me pater missurus, nec ego pasturus.*" Among the recent interpreters, Sack. לָכֵן accordingly is to be translated, "for you, or for your good." A strong objection to this interpretation is derived from v. 11. The עֲנִיֵּי הַצֹּאן there standing immediately before בֵּן, shows, that לָכֵן here also is to be considered as compounded of ל and כֵן. Moreover, the form לָכֶן as *pron. fœm.* never occurs, though this may be accidental; according to analogy, it must be pointed, not with *Zere*, but with *Segol*, from which there are only a few exceptions, as בָּהֶם and בָּהֵם in some passages; and on account of the following עֲנִיֵּי, instead of the *pron. fœm.*, we should expect the *mascul.*, though it may be replied that the first relates to the sheep, the second to those represented by them. Were there no other interpretation within our reach, and only one of the three last objections could be applied, it would signify but little; when combined, how-

ever, they have force, and the answers to them are insufficient. Finally, in this interpretation it is assumed, though not indeed absolutely necessary, that "the most miserable sheep," are different from "the flock of slaughter," which, as we shall soon see, is erroneous. — Still other interpretations, as those of Cocceius and Mark, and changes of the text, as those of Jahn, we may well pass over on account of their manifest incorrectness. — *The miserable of the sheep*, according to the Hebrew usage, in which the superlative is expressed by a comparison of the whole with a part by means of a *stat. constr.*, comp. Ewald, p. 576, are the most miserable sheep. But the question now arises, what is the whole, the flock of sheep, with which the part is here compared. If we assume as such a definite flock of sheep, the people of Israel, then, by *the miserable*, one particular portion, peculiarly miserable, is designated; if, on the contrary, we take as such the sheep in general, as an image of all men and nations, then *the most miserable sheep* would signify the whole of the covenant people. The *former* interpretation is the more usual; it supposes, that there is here a contrast, similar to Ezek. 34: 16, "I will seek that which is lost, bring back that which has wandered, bind up that which is wounded, and strengthen that which is sick; but that which is fat and strong will I destroy." It is subjoined, that the most miserable here are those also, who, humbled by adversity, long for deliverance. But a closer examination shows, that the latter interpretation is the true one. It is not liable to the objection, that still, v. 11, by "the most miserable sheep," only a part of the people, those who feared God, are designated. For this more particular description does not there lie in "the most miserable sheep" itself, but in "which adhere to me," and this very addition shows, rather that "the most miserable sheep," in itself considered, was general, and belonged to no particular class, but to the whole people. What however is especially decisive for the latter, are the two parallel passages of Jeremiah, chap. 49: 20; "Of a truth, they (the Idumeans) will worry the smallest sheep," צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאן. Entirely the same is chap. 50: 45, in reference to the Chaldeans. In both passages "the smallest sheep" is the designation of the Israelites in opposition to all the neighbouring nations. To this must be added, that the Lord, according to v. 6 and 9, undertakes the pastoral office, not over a part of the people, but over the whole, and for their good. Finally, this interpretation alone is reconcilable with the words themselves. These cannot be explained with

Calvin: "*Quoniam erant misellæ quædam oves.*" The ellipsis must rather be thus supplied, "therefore because they were the most miserable sheep"; so that "the most miserable sheep" are identified with "the flock of slaughter," which signifies the whole people. — The taking of two shepherd's staves, according to numerous interpreters, signifies God's different modes of proceeding with the people. Thus e. g. Michaelis: "*Duos se adhibuisse dicit, ut oves innuat non uno modo a se pastas fuisse.*" But this assumption rests on an erroneous interpretation of the names of the staves. The shepherd's staff is the instrument with which he affords protection and safety to his flock, Ps. 23: 4. "Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me." The taking of two staves, accordingly, signifies the turning away of a twofold danger by the faithful shepherd, from outward enemies, and from internal discord, precisely the same by which the people, according to v. 6, in case of their stiff-necked obduracy, should be destroyed. Now, so long as the last effort to lead them to repentance endures, the danger is still warded off by the faithful shepherd. Afterwards it breaks in upon them with fearful power. — Most interpreters take נֹעַם in the sense *loveliness* or *beauty*, (Seventy, κάλλος. *Aquila* and *Symm.* εὐπρέπεια. Jerome, *decus.*) But, according to this interpretation, the appellation would have but little significance; the staff signifies, even according to v. 10, the mercy of the Lord, whereby he secures the people against destruction from outward enemies. Moreover נֹעַם, however frequently this may have been asserted, never has the meaning *loveliness*, but rather always that of *kindness*, *favor*, which has been proved to belong to it in this passage by J. D. Michaelis (*Supplem.* p. 1630), with the remark, that the meaning *loveliness* can have no relation to the following חֹבְלִים, however the latter may be interpreted. Ps. 90: 17, ("May נֹעַם of the Lord our God be upon us,") the sense *favor* needs no farther proof. Prov. 15: 26, "An abomination to the Lord are the thoughts of the wicked, and pure are אִמְרֵי נֹעַם," is plainly to be translated *words of kindness*, as clearly appears from the antithesis with the thoughts of the wicked, his plots for the destruction of others. Equally obvious is the meaning *favor*, chap. 3: 17, 16: 24. Ps. 27: 4, is to be translated, "to behold the favor of the Lord (נֹעַם יְהוָה)," i. q. to enjoy his favor. — The second name חֹבְלִים, according to an interpretation widely diffused, is taken in a bad sense, either in the sense *perdentes*, or *dolentes*, therefore, as an antithesis to the staff *kindness*, the staff *woe*, with which the people

should be punished in case they should reject the pastoral office of the Lord. Thus, among the moderns, Theiner (kindness and torment), and Sack, (l. c. p. 301,) who remarks, an antithesis of mildness and severity is almost necessarily required by the connexion. It is seldom, however, that we find an interpretation so widely spread, which can be shown by such decisive arguments to be erroneous. 1. The *verb* חָבַל has neither in Kal nor in Niphal the sense *to corrupt* or *to become corrupted*, and much less *to experience pain*. And we very much wonder, that the meaning *corrupit*, which has already been contested by Gousset, and so admirably by Schultens (*ad Jobum*, p. 964), should still be always given in the Lexicons as undoubted. The passage on which it is grounded can easily be set aside. Neh. 1 : 7, "We have sinned against thee," חַבַּלְנוּ לָךְ, is commonly translated, "We have become corrupt to thee," or "We have acted wickedly towards thee," but it must rather be, "We are pledged to thee," *omni pignore obstricti tibi tenemur ad pœnam*, which Schultens appropriately explains out of the Arabic Sentences; "Every man is pledged to death, every evil doer to punishment," or "Every man pledges himself in that which he does." Job 34 : 31, the common explanation is, "I repent and will no more do evil," (לֹא אֶחְבֹּל.) But it must rather be explained, *luo quod non contraxi, pœnas pendo innocens;* properly, "I repent, or suffer without having pledged myself." In like manner, Prov. 13 : 13, "Whoever despises the word, יֵחָבֵל לוֹ, is pledged to himself," viz. to punishment. So in Kal and Niphal there is not a single example in which the sense *to destroy* is even probable. That it occurs in Pi. can prove nothing. For this may be founded in a modification of the idea of the verb, produced by the conjugation. חָבַל, *to bind*, and *to be bound*, in Pi. *to ensnare*, and then *destroy*. It is unnecessary with the recent lexicographers (comp. e. g. Winer, s. v.) to assume, that a double root is combined in חָבַל. Abicht l. c. p. 1100, has already shown how all the senses are derived from one original meaning, *to bind*, and *to be bound*. 2. It is an objection to this interpretation, as Calvin has already remarked, that the Lord uses this staff in taking care of the flock during the day of mercy, and when that terminates, according to v. 14, *breaks it in pieces*. Hence it is manifest, that the staff must designate, not punishments, but blessings. As the breaking of the first staff, so also does that of the second, signify the withdrawal of a divine blessing, and, accordingly, the taking of it must signify the imparting of such a blessing, and indeed especially

that of harmony among the people themselves, since this is done away by the breaking of the staff. 3. In this interpretation also, it is difficult to explain the plural. — Other interpreters, seeing it to be inadmissible, have attributed to the word the sense of *binding*, and indeed under a threefold modification. Several ancient interpreters give to the word the sense *cord*, while they regarded חֹבֵל either only as a different form of חֶבֶל, *cord*, or pointed differently. So the Seventy, Aquil., Symm. Jerome: "*Et alteram vocavi funiculos.*" Then Calvin, who points חֲבָלִים. Others, as Drusius, Fuller, Mark, take the word as a participle in an active sense, "those who bind." Others finally, after De Dieu, as a participle in a passive sense, "the allied," or "the confederated." There can indeed be no doubt, that the word in general means *to bind*, and that not merely in a literal, but also in a metaphorical sense. This is shown by the derivative words חֹבֵל *a sailor*, (*ligator funis nautici*,) חֶבֶל *cord*, and *connexion*, *company* (נְבִיאִים חֶבֶל, 1 Sam. 10: 5, 10, rightly the Seventy, *χορὸς προφητῶν*), תַּחְבֻלוֹת, *consilia* (*nectere dolos.*) But there can be just as little doubt, that חָבַל in the Hebrew, along with the active has also the passive sense. This appears even from the metaphorical use of the verb to pledge, it signifies not merely *to pledge* (to bind one to others), but also *to be pledged, to pledge one's self* (to be bound, and to bind one's self), comp. the cited passages from Job and Nehemiah. In the Arabic, the two corresponding verbs خبل and حبل, originally constituting only one root, in the first conjugation, together with the active, have also the passive, and reflexive meaning. خَبَلَ *to pledge* and *to destroy*, both arising from the idea of binding, the latter inasmuch as that which is destroyed finds itself under constraint, in a forced condition, خَبِلَ *demens, maniacus fuit*, to be bound in spirit. حَبَلَ *fœdus inivit*, and حَبِلَ *prægnans fuit*, a condition of corporeal bondage, as madness is of spiritual. The choice accordingly cannot be difficult among the three modifications which have been mentioned. The first, as being arbitrary, cannot come under consideration; the second is untenable, because it furnishes no reason for the use of the plural; for who should the *binders* be. The third has every thing in its favor. According to this, in full accordance with v. 14, by the second staff is designated the brotherly concord, existing among the covenant people them-

selves, through the influence of the Lord during the time of mercy. — וָאֶרְעֶה אֶת־הַצֹּאן, "and so I fed the flock," is not a superfluous repetition, but indicates that the staff was used in feeding. Correctly, as to the sense, several, *quibus pavi gregem.*

V. 8. "*And I extirpated the three shepherds in one month, and I was disgusted with them; and also their soul rebelled against me.*" We here first inquire, who is to be understood by the three shepherds. We reject at once the view of those, who, as Calvin, Jahn, Rosenmüller, suppose, that the definite number here stands for the indefinite, three for several. It must then instead of "*the* three shepherds," necessarily read "three shepherds," (comp. Ewald, p. 568.) In like manner, the article decides against those who understand, by the three shepherds, three definite individuals. These individuals must then either be already mentioned in the preceding context, so that it was requisite only to refer to them, — but here no mention has preceded, — or the prophet must have presupposed them to be so well known to his hearers, that they could not be mistaken. But here it is equally difficult to find three such individuals. This is evident from the fact, that, among the defenders of the reference to three individuals, scarcely two coincide in determining who they are. To this must be added, that the most of these interpretations are to be at once rejected, because they seek the three shepherds in the time before the Babylonish exile, while the discourse here relates to a future event. There can therefore be no doubt, that the prophet speaks, not of three individual shepherds, but of three orders of shepherds. Those who have perceived this, divide again into different classes. Junius and Trem., Piscator and Lightfoot, understand the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, an opinion which is at once to be rejected, because these Jewish parties could not be designated as the *shepherds* of the people; Mark, the civil, ecclesiastical, and military leaders; but he has furnished no proof that the latter are anywhere represented, as one of the pastoral orders existing in the Theocracy. If it is established, that by "the three shepherds" are designated the three classes of shepherds, or leaders of the people existing in the Theocracy, the only correct course must be, to inquire, whether in Zechariah himself, or in the other authors of the Old Testament, especially those who lived nearest to him, three classes of shepherds are mentioned, as the only leaders of the Theocracy. If we proceed in this way, it appears that Zechariah cannot possibly have had in view any other than the civil magistrates,

the priests, and the prophets. This interpretation is the most ancient of all. It is found in Theodoret: *Τοὺς Ἰουδαίων λέγει βασιλέας, καὶ προφήτας καὶ ἱερέας. διὰ γὰρ τούτων τῶν τριῶν ἐποιμαίνοντο ταγμάτων.* Likewise Cyril, only that he substitutes the scribes for the prophets, for a reason which may be easily conceived: *Οἶμαι δὴ οὖν, ὅτι τρεῖς ὀνομάζει ποιμένας, τοὺς τε κατὰ νόμον ἱερατεύοντας, καὶ τοὺς τεταγμένους κριτὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ προσέτι τούτοις τοὺς γραμματοεισαγωγεῖς, κατέβοσκον γὰρ οὗτοι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ.* Jerome also mentions it: "*Legi in cujusdam commentariis pastores domini indignatione succisos in sacerdotibus, et falsis prophetis, et regibus intelligi Judæorum, quod post passionem Christi uno omnia succisa sint tempore.*" That it was not exclusively prevalent in later times, arose from the difficulty of showing the existence of the prophetic order in the time of Christ. How else could other shepherds have been thought of than those who uniformly occur in connexion, as such, to the exclusion of all others, and who at the same time, as here, are represented as the chief cause of the destruction and misery of the people? Numerous passages of Jeremiah may be compared, e. g. 2: 8, "The priests spake not, Where is the Lord? the students of the law (likewise the priests) knew me not, the shepherds (here especially of the civil magistrates) sinned against me, and the prophets prophesied in Baal"; v. 26, "As the thief is ashamed when he is caught, so shall the house of Israel be ashamed, they, — their kings, their princes (both together constitute the one order of the civil magistrates), and their priests, and their prophets." 18: 18, "And they say; Up, let us lay plots against Jeremiah; for the law cannot perish from the priests, nor counsel from the wise (counsel along with might, the peculiar attribute of the civil magistrates, גְּבוּרָה), nor the word of the prophets." If we compare Zechariah himself, we find the two other classes of shepherds, together with the prophetic order, which he himself represents, most definitely mentioned, chap. 4: 12 – 14. To the question, What are the two branches of the olive trees, which supply the candlesticks (the Theocracy) with the oil expressed from their fruits? the prophet receives the answer, "These are the two oil-children, who stand before the Lord of the whole earth." Here the priesthood and the civil magistracy are designated as the two orders, through whom the Lord imparts his grace to the Theocracy, the former at that time represented by Joshua, the other by Zerubbabel. For that these were designated, not as individuals, appears from the comparison of chap. 3, where Joshua uniformly appears,

not as an individual, but as a representative, partly of the priesthood, partly of the whole people. The passage is therefore so far analogous to this, that in it the orders of the leaders of the people appear personified as individuals. In this relation, Mal. 2 : 7, is still to be compared, where the order of the priesthood is called "the servant of the Lord of Hosts." — The only difficulty that still remains, is, how the prophetic order can here be mentioned together with the three orders of leaders in the Theocracy, since it had already ceased at the time of the fulfilment. We answer, the prophet, in accordance with the nature of prophecy, here also designates the future, by an analogy existing in his time. As the order of the civil shepherds continued, even when the kingdom had come to an end, so also the prophetic order, as to its essence, continued after the cessation of the prophetic gift. Its destination was, to impart to the people the word and will of God, Jer. 18 : 18. Before the completion of the Canon, this was done by a revelation granted immediately to them, and afterwards by the investigation of former revelations under the guidance of the spirit of God, and by the application of them to the existing relations. In the place of the prophets succeeded the scribes, to whom, according to Sirach, chap. 39, the Lord richly gave the spirit of understanding, who studied the wisdom of the ancients and searched the prophets, who propounded doctrine and judgment, and by whom wise sentences were invented. They stood to the ancient prophets in the same relation as the enlightened teachers of the later Christian church to the prophets of the New Testament. — The question now arises, what is to be understood by the extirpation of the three shepherds. Several interpreters suppose a literal extirpation of the individuals. But then they are embarrassed by the circumstance, that the extirpation of the shepherds precedes the breaking of the staves. The method by which they have endeavoured to free themselves from this embarrassment is inadmissible. (Frischmuth : "*Bene Sanctius monet hysteron proteron hic esse, sive prolepsin, quando quidem is ordo rerum sit, ut prius iratus fuerit et virga abscissa, quam pastores occiderentur. Atque hæc trajectio itidem Abarbanel observata.*") The following *fut.* with *vau convers.* must then be understood as pluperfect; but this tense forms the exact antithesis to the *fut.* with *vau convers.*; Ewald, p. 543. Actions which are expressed by a series of *fut.* with *vau convers.* must always follow each other in regular succession; Ewald, p. 541. It cannot, therefore, be a literal extirpation which is spoken of, because imme-

diately thereafter, the shepherds appear as still in existence. It is they who provoke the good shepherd to impatience, and manifest the utmost hostility towards him, which likewise, on account of the use of the *fut.* with *vau convers.* (וַתִּקָּצֵר), is not to be regarded as preceding the extirpation, but as its consequence. It is their obstinate resistance, rendering useless all his pastoral efforts, which moves him to break the staves, and relinquish his office. We can therefore conceive only of an extirpation of the shepherds, as such, i. e. a deposition of them from their pastoral office. To effect this was the most zealous object of the Lord during *his* pastoral office; but the same disposition, which rendered them deserving of this, also prevented the sentence, spoken against them with full authority, from being carried into execution in its whole extent. Only the most miserable of the sheep, who have regard to the Lord, (v. 11,) withdrew themselves from their pernicious guidance. After the rejection of the whole people, who knew not their own good, the sentence was first executed in its whole extent by foreign foes, while the people did not now receive good shepherds instead of bad, which would have been the case, if they had themselves carried into execution the good shepherd's decree of extirpation. — The extirpation of the shepherds happened in one month. This cannot, as Kimchi, Calvin, and others suppose, stand simply for "*in a little time.*" Hitzig might then justly ask, l. c. p. 30, "Wherefore then the month, when probably a day or hour would be more suitably mentioned?" That the prophet, if he designed merely to express the shortest time, would rather have said, "in one day," appears especially from the parallel passage, chap. 3 : 9, where it is said of the atonement to be effected by the Messiah: "I blot out the sin of this land *in one day*," (בְּיוֹם אֶחָד.) The expression, "in one month," as whose *terminus a quo* the commencement of the pastoral office is to be taken, expresses rather, in relation to the phrase "in one day," a longer, and in relation to all other periods, a shorter time. It shows, that the extirpation of the three shepherds is not, like the atonement, to be considered as a single act, but as one protracted for some time. Thus, therefore, in a very appropriate manner, the continued efforts of Christ are designated, to deliver the poor people, the lost sheep of the house of Israel, out of the spiritual power of their blind and corrupt leaders. — וַתִּקְצַר נַפְשִׁי בָּהֶם, properly *brevis facta est anima mea in eis.* Rightly Schultens on Prov. 20 : 21 : "*Ea phrasis non tam tædium significat, quam indignationem ex intolerandis injuriis*

oriundam, sub quibus anima velut angatur ac suffocetur. — Ubique impatientia gravissime vexati, oppressi, elisi, qui vix respirare queat amplius, eluctet." The verb בָּחַל is here explained by most interpreters, according to a comparison of the Syriac, by *to experience disgust.* But this is not entirely accurate. Schultens l. c. has already shown, that the verb designates the inimical disposition of the three shepherds against the good shepherd, and at the same time its moral turpitude; and therefore it could not have been used of the disposition of the good shepherd towards the bad. In Arabic بَخَلَ designates, in general, a low, vile disposition, and is used especially of base avarice. In Hebrew this meaning prevails in the only passage besides, where the *verb* occurs, Prov. 20 : 21. נְחָלָה מְבֹחֶלֶת is there, an inheritance obtained in a base manner. The evil shepherds are inflamed with mean hatred against the good shepherd, because he exposes their meanness, and will take from them their dominion. They do all in their power, therefore, to hinder him in the execution of his commission. *Their soul* does not, according to the favorite supposition of the recent interpreters of the Psalms, stand for the bare personal pronoun, just as if one should assert, that "he causes me grief *in the soul*," is nothing more than, "he causes me grief"; it rather signifies the violence and depth of the abhorrence.

V. 9. "*Thus said I then: I will not feed you; that which dies, shall die, that which is destroyed, shall be destroyed, and those that remain, shall consume one another.*" Calvin: "*Quando non sunt sanabiles, neque remedium patiuntur adhiberi suis malis, jam relinquo eos; experientur, quid sit carere bono pastore.*" The feminines of the verse are to be referred to the sheep. After the Seventy (ἀποθνησκέτω), and Jerome, several take the futures optatively; but this is forbidden by the form, for, in that case, the *fut. apoc.* must stand instead of תָּמֹת, Ewald, p. 527. We must, therefore, rather understand the future as prophetical. The dead and the destroyed, that which is devoted to so sure a destruction, that it can be already considered as dead and destroyed. This destruction could have been turned aside only by obedience to the good shepherd. Now, since he has been compelled to relinquish his office, the matter takes its natural course. A threefold sort of destruction is here given, as the comparison of parallel passages shows; contagious diseases, as they are accustomed to arise in besieged cities, ("the dead will die") a violent death by foreign enemies, and a fearful rage of

the citizens against one another, occasioned by the distress. These passages are as follows: Jer. 15: 1, 2; "And the Lord said to me: Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, my mind could not be towards this people, cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth. And if they say unto thee: Whither shall we go forth? then thou shalt tell them, Thus saith the Lord, he that is for death, (is destined, he goes) to death, and he who is for the sword, to the sword; he who is for hunger, to hunger; and he who is for captivity, to captivity." 34: 17, "Behold, ye have not hearkened, that ye proclaim liberty, every one for his brother, and every one for his neighbour; behold, I proclaim then for you a liberty to the *sword*, to the pestilence, and to the *famine*." Ezek. 6: 12, "That which is afar off shall die by the pestilence, that which is near shall fall by the sword, and that which remains and is preserved shall die by hunger." Comp. also below, chap. 13: 8, where "they shall die on the sick bed, יִגָּוְעוּ," and "they shall be extirpated, יִכָּרְתוּ," correspond to הַמּוֹת and הִכָּחֵד. That this threefold sort of destruction actually effected the overthrow of the Jewish state, needs no farther proof. — "*And those which are left shall eat the flesh one of another.*" Mark: "*Ex rabie fera, in quam præter naturam hæ oves degenerabunt.*" In a manner entirely similar the rage of the citizens of the kingdom of Israel against one another before its destruction, occasioned by their distress, is described in Isaiah 9: 18 sq. "They spare not one another. They devour on the right hand, they devour on the left hand, and are not satisfied, each one devours the flesh of his arm," (he rages against his own flesh, inasmuch as those who devour one another are members of one community, one political body.)

V. 10. "*And so I took my staff Grace and brake it, that I might abolish my covenant which I had concluded with all nations.*" That which had been predicted in the preceding verse in words, is here, and v. 14, indicated by a double symbolical action; the devastation by foreign nations by the breaking of the staff Kindness or Grace, the internal discord by the breaking of the staff of the Allied, or more correctly, the prediction contained in the following verse, is here followed by the account of its execution. Calvin: "*Emphatice hoc dictum est, quasi diceret propheta, non debere adscribi fortunæ, quod res in deterius mutatæ sint, quia hoc modo exsecutus sit dominus judicium suum, postquam nimis patienter tulerit malitiam populi.*" The image of the flock is not strictly preserved; the thing signified appears in the phrase, "with all nations"; in accordance

with the image it must have been, "with all wild beasts." Comp. Is. 56 : 9, "All ye beasts of the field, come to devour; come, all ye beasts in the wood." The thought, that hitherto the covenant people had been preserved by a secret influence of the divine omnipotence from destruction by foreign foes, is figuratively expressed, as though the Lord had made a covenant for the good of the Israelites, with all nations of the earth, which is now abolished by the breaking of the staff Grace. A similar figurative representation is found elsewhere also. Thus it is said, Job 5 : 23, in order to express the thought, that no creature could injure him who was befriended by God; "For with the stones of the field shall be thy covenant, and the beasts of the field shall befriend thee." Thus it is said, Hos. 2 : 20, to designate the security of the covenant people before earthly foes, after they had obtained favor from their chief foe, the Lord; "And I make for them a covenant in this day with the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven, and the worm of the earth; and I will break the bow, and the sword, and the war, and I make them dwell safely." But the passage which Zechariah seems to have had immediately in view, is that of Ezek. 34 : 25, "And I conclude for them a covenant of peace, and make the evil beasts to cease out of the land, and they dwell in the wilderness securely, and sleep in the woods," which differs from the one before us, only in more strictly preserving the image of a flock. Zechariah announces, that this covenant, concluded after the return from the exile, by the Lord, for the good of his people, should now be abolished by the punishment of their shocking apostasy. — Had due regard been paid to these parallel passages we should scarcely have had to mention other interpretations of the verse. That by Blaney, "in order to annul my covenant, which I had concluded *before* all nations, *coram omnibus populis*," does not deserve to be refuted; perhaps, however, that may, according to which, by "the nations," the tribes of Israel are understood. (Mark: "*Cum numerosis tribubus Israel.*") It is liable to the objection, that, by the breaking of the staff *Grace*, a *special* effect of the divine displeasure must be intended, because otherwise the breaking of the staff of the Allied does not accord with it. Moreover, even assuming, that, by "the nations," the tribes of Israel could be designated, still this interpretation is here excluded by the subjoined כָּל־. But the assertion, that עַמִּים not unfrequently stands for the tribes of Israel, is entirely erroneous. The word עַמִּים never occurs simply in this sense. The passages which are

cited in favor of it (comp. e. g. Winer, s. v.) fall into three classes. 1. Those in which this supposition is entirely groundless, as Gen. 49 : 10, Deut. 32 : 8, Is. 62 : 10, (according to Ges. on the passage,) where the עַמִּים plainly designates heathen nations. 2. Those where עַמִּים stands in the sense *people*, e. g. Lev. 19 : 16, "Thou shalt not calumniate בְּעַמֶּיךָ." 21 : 14, "He married a virgin מֵעַמָּיו," (comp. 7 : 20, 21 : 1, 4, &c.) Deut. 33 : 3. If it there refer to the tribes, it must have the article; the meaning *people* appears also from v. 19, where it is said of Zebulon and Issachar, "People will call them to the mountain." 3. Those where עַמִּים is spoken of the Israelitish tribes only by a kind of hyperbole, by a silent comparison with numerous nations. Thus, perhaps, Gen. 28 : 3, in the promise to Abraham, "Thou shalt become a multitude of nations," although here also a concurrent reference to the other nations, to be descended from Abraham, can be assumed; certainly, however, chap. 48 : 4, in the promise to Jacob, "I make thee for a multitude of nations." Surely we cannot conclude from this passage, that עַמִּים could be used also of the Israelites, where it is not the object, as there, to render prominent the great increase of the people, in contrast with their small beginning.

V. 11. "*And so was the covenant in that day abolished; and therefore the most miserable sheep, who adhered to me, experienced that this is the word of the Lord.*" It appears from this verse, that the efforts of the good shepherd were still not entirely in vain, but that a small remnant of true disciples joined him. These were designated by those, who observed him, had their eye directed continually to him, did all in accordance with his nod and will. As, after the abolition of the covenant, the enemies invaded the land, they perceived, that what had been spoken beforehand of the destruction to be effected by the Lord, was no empty human threatening, but really a divine prophecy. The prophet here also employs the past, because that which was represented in his inward vision, had already taken place. Were the prophecy divested of the drapery of a symbolic action, it would read, "Then when my covenant has been abolished, my worshippers shall know, from the fulfilment, the divine origin of this my sentence concerning Israel." הוּא relates to the prediction contained in v. 9, 10. Verbally parallel is Jer. 32 : 6 – 8, "The Lord said to me; behold, Hanameel comes to thee saying, buy my field; and Hanameel came to me and said, Buy yet my field, וָאֵדַע כִּי דְבַר־יְהוָה הוּא, and so I knew, that it was the word

of the Lord." By the fulfilment of the divine word, Jeremiah is here still more firmly convinced, that he has not confounded a human suggestion with a divine revelation. That the fulfilment would testify for the divine origin of his prophecies, is a favorite remark of Zechariah, comp. 2 : 13, where the angel of the Lord says, "Then shall ye know that the Lord of Hosts has sent me." In like manner, v. 15, 6 : 15, *in the day*, viz. "on which I had broken my staff"; or, without a figure, "after I had turned away my favor from the people, the hostile nations hitherto restrained by me, fell upon them." עַל־כֵּן, *therefore, even from this.*

V. 12. "*And I said to them; If it seems good to you, give me my reward; if not, withhold it; and they weighed to me as my reward thirty pieces of silver.*" "And I said to them:" Jahn remarks, that this cannot refer to the flock, but to the shepherds, because only from them could the reward be demanded. But this is incorrect. Since the shepherd deals with the flock itself respecting that, which in other cases was wont to be transacted only with the owner, he shows, that this flock consists of rational creatures. With the exclusion of the inferior and more despised portion of the people, with whom the pastoral office of the Lord, as had been said in the foregoing verse, had been attended with a desirable result, he here treats with the greater and more powerful portion, who had compelled him by their obstinacy to relinquish his office. It is true, that in this transaction the leaders of the people are chiefly to be considered, not, however, as shepherds, but as members of the flock, as also in Ezek. chap. 34, they appear now as shepherds, now as he-goats, or as fat sheep, in contrast with those which are poor. Of the shepherds as such, the Lord could not demand the reward, because he had not devoted himself at all to their service, but had endeavoured to rescue the flock from them. The sense of the words, *If it seems good to you, give me my reward; if not, withhold it*, is well unfolded by Calvin: "*Hic exprimit summam indignationem, quemadmodum si quis exprobret malitiam et ingratitudinem proximo suo: Agnosce beneficium, si voles; sin minus, mihi perierit; ego non curo: ego video te esse nebulonem, qui indignus fueras, quem ego liberaliter tractarem. Ego igitur nihil moror tuas compensationes, sed interea tuum erat videre, quid mihi deberes.*" The parallel passages are Jer. 40 : 4, "If it is good in thine eyes to go with me to Babylon, go; and, if it is evil in thine eyes, refrain, חֲדַל." Ezek. 3 : 27, "Thus saith the Lord: He that hears, let him hear, and he that

refrains, let him refrain, וְחָדֵל יֶחְדָּל," comp. 2 : 5 – 7, 3 : 11, Jer. 26 : 14. — *My reward*, that which I deserve, which I have earned by severe labor. *They weighed;* gold for a long time was not counted, but weighed; hence, long after this practice had ceased, they used the expression "to weigh" for "to count," comp. Jahn, *Archäol.* I. 2, § 138. By the *reward*, the interpreters for the most part understand repentance and faith. So Jarchi: "*Servate præceptum meum; hæc enim merces mea erit pro omni bono, quod dedi vobis, quemadmodum sua pastori merces datur.*" Theodoret: Ἐνταῦθα τοίνυν αἰτεῖ μὲν αὐτοὺς ὁ δεσπότης μισθὸν τῆς εὐεργεσίας τὴν πίστιν· οἱ δὲ ἀντὶ ταύτης τοὺς τριάκοντα ἔδοσαν ἀργυροῦς. Eusebius: Αἰτῶν αὐτοὺς ὡς εἰκὸς καρποὺς εὐσεβείας καὶ δεῖγμα τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστέως. Two interpretations in reference to the thirty pieces of silver, are adopted by those who do not, like far the greater number of Christian interpreters, find a direct and exclusive reference to the thirty pieces of silver, received by Judas. The one is that of Jarchi and Kimchi: "*Fuerunt pauci inter illos boni, facientes voluntatem meam.*" The other, that of Calvin and Grotius, which we give in the words of the former: "*Per vile pretium, quod bubulco dignum esset, intelligit frivolas nugas, quibus Judæi putabant se posse satisfacere deo. Requirit cordis integritatem, et ideo se nobis addicit, ut vicissim nos totos possideat. Hoc igitur erat pretium laboris, quod dominus fuerat meritus, hæc erat justa merces, si se in obsequium totos Judæi addicerent ejus verbo.*" — But all these interpretations are untenable. We cannot, by the reward, understand faith or piety of heart; for the Lord does not demand this reward, until he has already entirely given over the people, withdrawn his favor from them, until therefore they could no longer bring forth the fruits of repentance, but were rather devoted to destruction. This demand was made during the time of his pastoral office. By the thirty pieces of silver, we cannot understand the repentance and faith of the few believers; for then they would be something good, while still, according to v. 13, they were to be thrown into an unclean place. As little can they mean sacrifices and ceremonies, without faith. For these must be more particularly specified, which is not done in any measure except on the false supposition, that by the reward, which the Lord required, faith and sincere piety were designated. — Rather, only the thought is expressed, that after the Lord has given up his pastoral office, and already proclaimed the woe upon Jerusalem, the people have sinned against him by an action of the blackest

ingratitude. That the good shepherd had *well-grounded claims* to the gratitude of the people, is expressed by his asking them for the reward of his services; the wicked ingratitude of the people, by their offering to weigh him thirty pieces of silver, a sum so contemptible (*Maimonides, Mor. Neb. C.* 40. *Part.* 3, "*ut plus minus reperies hominem liberum æstimari sexaginta siclis, servum vero triginta*"; comp. Exod. 21 : 32), that the offer of it for such services, performed by such a person, is more offensive than an entire refusal, and therefore suited rather to heighten than diminish the ingratitude, a thought which in the following verse is embodied in a symbolic action. That by this, the only correct interpretation, much insight is gained into the prophecy itself, as well as its relation to the evangelical history, is obvious.

V. 13. "*And the Lord said to me; throw it to the potter, the glorious price at which I am estimated by them; and I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them into the house of the Lord, that they might be carried from there to the potter.*" The Lord addresses the prophet, who represents his person. This clearly appears from "at which I have been estimated." The verb הִשְׁלִךְ, "to cast away," sometimes with the accessory idea of contempt; comp. Jer. 22 : 19, "He (Jehoiakim) shall be cast away beyond the gates of Jerusalem." 52 : 3, "Until he cast them away from his sight." Ez. 20 : 8. The expression *to the potter* could not have been so variously misunderstood, nor, as it has happened in the case of Rosenmüller, (*Etsi vero hæc verba satis sint aperta, sensu tamen ita sunt occulta, ut eum sagacioribus enucleandum relinquere coacti simus,*) would the interpretation have been entirely given over on account of it, if the aids to be found in Jeremiah had been carefully employed, who performs the same service for Zechariah, as Ezekiel and Daniel for the Apocalypse. The conviction would then have been soon produced, that "to the potter" here is the same as "in an unclean place, to the executioner, or to the flayer." The potter, who is here meant, (probably, as appears from the concurrent use of the article here, in Jeremiah, and Matthew, the potter who worked for the temple, since it cannot be supposed, that, in general, there was but one potter for all Jerusalem,) had his workshop in the valley of Hinnom, probably because the earth, required for his business, was found there in peculiar abundance, or of a better quality. This appears from the following reasons. That the workshop was out of the city, and indeed in the valley which lies beneath it, appears from Jer.

18 : 1, where the prophet, while in the temple, receives the command, "Arise, go *down* to the house of the potter;" comp. v. 3, "And I went *down* to the house of the potter." But we are led especially to the valley of Hinnom by Jer. 19 : 2. "Go down to the valley of the son of Hinnom, which lies in the brick gate, and proclaim there the words which I will speak to thee." According to this, the gate, which led to the valley of Hinnom, was called the brick or pot gate, from the pottery before it. For that שַׁעַר הַחַרְסִית must be thus translated (comp. Winer, s. v.) properly "the gate of the pottery," appears from the plain allusion to v. 1, where חָרֵשׂ would have been superfluous, as well as from the fact that Jeremiah would not have named the gate before which the valley of Hinnom lay, because generally known and elsewhere designated only by the name of the valley-gate, (comp. Neh. 2 : 13 – 15, with Jer. 2 : 23, in which latter place the valley of Hinnom is called κατ' ἐξοχήν *the valley*,) if there were not a reference to the thing itself in the appellation of the gate. The valley of Hinnom, however, formerly the scene of the most frightful idolatrous abominations, was regarded by the later Jews with disgust and horror, as an unclean place, after Josiah had polluted it by carrion, human bones, and such like, comp. 2 Kings 23 : 10; so that finally even the opinion expressed in the Talmud was formed, that there was the mouth of hell; comp. Lightfoot, *Centur. Chorograph. Matth. Præm. Opp. t. II. p.* 200 : "*Sub templum secundum, cum evanuerant ea, quæ æternam infamiam huic loco inusserunt, remansit tamen tantum fœditatis atque abominandi nominis, ut etiam jam vivam repræsentationem orci æque præ se ferret, ac olim. — Erat communis totius urbis sentina, quo confluxit sordes omnis atque omnimoda spurcities.*" That Zechariah caused the base reward to be thrown into the valley of Hinnom, in general, and that he designates, as the particular place, the workshop or the field of the potter, have each a distinct reference to a prophecy of Jeremiah, and presuppose readers acquainted with his writings. The first refers to Jeremiah, chap. 19. The prophet there throws an empty earthen flask into the valley of Hinnom, accompanied by several of the oldest of the people and most distinguished priests. The meaning of this symbolic action is thus given : "Because they have filled this place with the blood of the innocent, — so I *empty out* the council of Judah and Jerusalem in this place, and I make them fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hand of those who seek their life, and give their corpses for food to the fowls

of heaven and the beasts of the earth. — So will I break this people and this city, as one breaks the vessels of a potter, which can no more be mended; and in Tophet shall they bury, because there is no more room. — Thus will I do to this place and its inhabitants, and make this city like Tophet. And the houses of Jerusalem and the houses of the kings of Judah shall be unclean as the place Tophet." Zechariah now causes the base reward to be thrown into the valley of the son of Hinnom or Tophet, in general because this was an unclean place, but especially in order to resume the prophecy of Jeremiah, and show that a second fulfilment of it was at hand, because the divine penal justice which had called forth the threatening, and its first fulfilment had been provoked anew, and indeed in a still more fearful manner. The memorial of the wicked ingratitude of the Jewish people, the *corpus delicti*, is conveyed to the same place, from which their former abominations had cried to God, and provoked his vengeance. It was there deposited, as it were a new pledge, which the people at the appointed time must redeem. — That precisely the possessions of the potter in the valley of Hinnom are chosen, is owing to Jeremiah, chap. 18. Jeremiah, at the command of the Lord, there makes a visit to the potter, who was just then at work. "And the vessel, which he was making out of the clay, was marred under his hands; then he made again out of the clay another vessel, as it pleased him." The meaning of this symbol is then given, "Can I not therefore do to you also, ye house of Israel, as this potter, saith the Lord? Behold, as the clay in the hand of the potter, so are ye in my hand. — Behold, I prepare for you misfortune, and entertain towards you thoughts of evil; therefore return each one from his evil disposition, and amend your disposition and your conduct." This truth, that the Lord, without acknowledging them to have any claim upon him, could and would reject his apostate people, if they did not repent in time, is here anew rendered prominent by Zechariah, when he causes the poor reward to be brought into the place in which Jeremiah had originally uttered the threatening; a place, the peculiarity of which also, at the time of the prophet, when the potter had again set up his workshop there, was suited to make it an object of sense. *This* prophecy of Jeremiah had again resumed its full power, as the former apostasy, which, in the first instance, occasioned it, was but slight in comparison with the present, the wicked ingratitude of the people towards the Lord, who had *himself* taken charge of his flock. — We believe we have so vindicated our

interpretation, which justifies and completes what was surmised by Grotius, that the examination of others may appear more or less superfluous. The most unfortunate, though most pretending, is plainly that, which gives as the sense, "to the treasury" or "the treasurer," with an appeal to the authority of the Syriac, which translates *treasure-house*, while it is directly asserted, either with Kimchi and Theiner, that יוֹצֵר is synonymous with אוֹצָר, or, with Jonathan, the meaning *treasurer* is given to יוֹצֵר, or, with Jahn and Hitzig (l. c. p. 35), the reading יוֹצֵר is preferred, which will then be synonymous with אוֹצָר. This interpretation is inadmissible, because even if the change of vowels be conceded, it understands the word in a sense in which it never elsewhere occurs, and is the more suspicious, the more frequently the word is found. It could surely have been advanced only by those who overlook the cited passages of Jeremiah. For, that there is a connexion between them and the passage before us, every one who looks at both must immediately perceive, although he may not at once discover the mode of this connexion; and this will be the more evident when he takes notice how almost every verse of this chapter stands related to Jeremiah, and that, elsewhere also in the same, traces of the use of Jeremiah, 18 and 19, are found; comp. with v. 9, Jer. 18: 21, 19: 9. It gives, however, no good sense, or rather it gives no sense at all. For how could the treasury of the temple be spoken of in this connexion? By being received into that, the thirty pieces of silver would rather be honored. — Verbatim, *the excellency of the price which I have been estimated by them*, for *the excellent price*, ironically, at which my person and my work have been valued by them; comp. Deut. 32: 6, "Give ye to the Lord such a reward, ye foolish, unwise people." — "*And I cast it* (*the sum* or *the price*) *into the house of the Lord, that it might be conveyed from there to the potter.*" It is very obvious, that the gold could not be carried at the same time into the temple and to the potter. For the potter did not work in the temple, nor even in the city, but, as we have already seen, in the valley of Hinnom. It must, therefore, necessarily be assumed, that the temple was the first, the potter's the second station; and this is also plainly enough expressed by the use of אֶל before הַיּוֹצֵר; hence "to the potter," for, "that it might be carried from there to the potter." The question, however, now arises, why the gold, which was finally to remain with the potter, was first cast into the temple. Plainly, because the temple was the place, where the people appeared before the face of

the Lord, the council-house, as it were, where the magistrates and citizens transacted their affairs with one another. Here, therefore, must the shameful ingratitude of the people also be cast upon them by the return of the contemptible reward. From there it must then be conveyed to the potter, because unlawful gold must not remain in the temple; comp. Deut. 23 : 19, *Talm. Tract. Sanhedrin*, f. 112.

We have hitherto unfolded the sense of v. 13 and 14, without reference to the fulfilment. The result is as follows. The Lord has at last once more undertaken the pastoral office over the flock devoted to destruction, the unhappy people, Israel; as he again relinquishes it on account of their stiff-necked unbelief, he demands his reward; they give him thirty pieces of silver, about the yearly wages of a common herdsman. He is not satisfied with this contemptible reward, and casts it into the temple. From there, as unclean, it is conveyed to the possession of the potter, where it is deposited until the day of judgment upon the people, as a pledge of the divine vengeance. We have learned, as the sense of this figurative representation, that the obduracy of the people, after the Lord should have given them up on account of it, would yet break forth in one great act of ingratitude towards him, and thereby make them fully ripe for the judgment.

The agreement of prophecy and fulfilment is here so striking, that it would force itself upon us although it were indicated by no declaration of the New Testament. What could the last and most fearful expression of ingratitude towards the good shepherd, here predicted, be, other than the murderous plot by which the Jews rewarded the pastoral fidelity of Christ, and for whose accomplishment Judas was bribed? But not merely in general, in the particulars also, we find the most accurate agreement between history and prophecy. The small reward of thirty pieces of silver, serves here in the first place only for a figurative designation of the blackest ingratitude and the highest contempt on the part of the Jews. But, that, among all small sums, precisely this only was chosen, which afterwards the betrayer Judas actually received, must still surprise us, and cannot be without an object. As in the bribing of the betrayer Judas, in general, the blackest ingratitude is obvious, so

are the foulest avarice, and the deepest contempt towards the Lord, manifest in the circumstance, that the priests allowed to Judas, when he left to them the determination of the reward (comp. Matt. 26 : 15) only the contemptible sum of thirty pieces of silver. It cannot with Paulus (Comm. III. p. 683) be replied, that, according to Zechariah, the thirty pieces of silver are counted to the shepherd, not to his betrayer. For, in the small reward which they gave to the betrayer, their contempt towards the shepherd manifests itself. It happened by the arrangement of God, under whose secret influence even the ungodly stand, that Judas cast the gold into the temple, and that therefore their ingratitude, as inwardly in Zechariah, so here outwardly, is charged upon the people by a symbolic action in the place where they appeared before the face of the Lord. The priests removed the gold as unclean out of the temple, and purchased therewith a mean spot in the same valley, which already at an earlier period, polluted by innocent blood, had brought upon Jerusalem the vengeance of the Lord, predicted by Jeremiah, the same spot where Jeremiah once predicted to the people their rejection. Here now lay the *price of blood*, τιμὴ αἵματος, (Matt. 27 : 6,) the reward for the betrayal of the *innocent blood* (αἷμα ἀθῷον, v. 4), from which the field received the name of *the field of blood* (ἀγρὸς αἵματος, v. 8, comp. Act. 1 : 19), as a testimony against Israel, as a pledge by which he had bound himself to suffer the divine punishment, similar to the former, which he must now redeem ; so that the threatening, which Jeremiah had uttered in reference to this former abomination, is now again in full force. Chap. 19 : 4 sq., " They have made this place full of innocent blood, — therefore, behold, days come, saith the Lord, when they shall no more call this place Tophet, and the valley of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter." We find the same also, chap. 7 : 32. In accordance with what appears from a comparison of the account of the New Testament with Jeremiah and Zechariah, tradition also places the field of blood in the valley of Hinnom. Comp. *Lightfoot in Acta Ap.*, *Opp.* II. p. 690. *Pococke* II. 38. *Bachiene* II. 1, p. 342.

Still the result so clearly furnished by a comparison of the prophecy and history is confirmed by an express testimony of the apostle Matthew, chap. 27 : 9. This testimony presents certain difficulties, which we shall here examine.

The form of citation must here first be considered, in which the prophecy is attributed not to Zechariah, but to Jeremiah, (Τότε

ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος.) We will not here give a collection of the different views respecting this problem; there is already a sufficiency of such collections, the best of which is that by Mark, in the *Exercitationes Miscell.* (well to be distinguished from his *Exercit. Textuales*), Amsterd. 1690, p. 314 sq. We hope that the establishment of our own will contribute at the same time to the refutation of the rest, and thus, making a further mention of them more or less superfluous, will a little lighten the already sufficiently laden ship of the exegesis.

Several older interpreters (Sanctius, Glassius, Frischmuth,) express the opinion, that Matthew cited a passage compounded out of Jeremiah and Zechariah, under the name of the former, only as the more distinguished. But the well grounded reply has been made, that then the passages of Jeremiah, a reference to which they assume, must actually refer to the event related by Matthew. They were not able to answer this objection, partly because they did not see in what relation the passage of Zechariah stood to those cited from Jeremiah, partly because they did not observe what deep meaning Matthew sought, in the fact that the potter's field was purchased with the price of blood, which, of all the interpreters, Grotius alone perceived, ("*Cum autem hoc dictum Jeremiæ per Sach. repetitum hic recitat Mat., simul ostendit tacite, eas pœnas imminere Judæis, quas iidem prophetæ olim sui temporis hominibus prædixerant.*") This objection is entirely removed by what has already been remarked. We have shown that the prophecy of Zechariah, as to its principal parts, is only a resumption of that of Jeremiah; that he announces a second fulfilment of it, which stands in a connexion with it by no means accidental, but necessary, because it rests on the idea of the divine penal justice, which must call forth a new fulfilment of the prophecy as soon as it shall have been again provoked.

Matthew might indeed have cited *both* prophets. But such prolixity in citation is entirely contrary to the custom of the authors of the New Testament, which may be explained by a twofold reason. They presuppose their readers to possess an accurate knowledge of Scripture, and the human instrument was kept far behind the divine author, the Spirit of God and of Christ, who spake in all the prophets in the same manner. Very frequently, therefore, and indeed almost always, the human author is not mentioned at all; they content themselves with the forms of citation: ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, καθὼς ἐστι γεγραμμένον, γέγραπται γάρ, καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καθὼς

εἶπεν ὁ θεός. κ. τ. λ. Not unfrequently two or three passages of different authors are combined in one, and yet only a single author is mentioned. The closest analogy with that before us is presented by Mark 1 : 2, 3 : Ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ· Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου. φωνὴ βοῶντος κ. τ. λ. Here, under the name of Isaiah, two prophecies of Malachi and Isaiah, are cited, of which moreover the former precedes. Isaiah was the more celebrated prophet; it was so usual to consider the minor prophets combined in one collection as a whole, that an individual of them is very rarely mentioned by name; comp. e. g. Matt. 21 : 5, with Isaiah 62 : 11, and Zech. 9 : 9, Matt. 21 : 13, with Isaiah 56 : 7, Jer. 7 : 11, Rom. 9 : 27, 1 Pet. 2 : 6 sq.

Had Matthew designed to awaken attention merely to the fulfilment of the prophecy of Zechariah, he would have contented himself with a general form of citation. This appears from the analogy of all other citations out of this prophet, in none of which is he mentioned by name. So, John 19 : 37, the passage, chap. 12 : 10, is cited merely with the words, καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει. John 12 : 14, the passage, chap. 9 : 9, by καθώς ἐστι γεγραμμένον. Matt. 26 : 31, the passage, chap. 13 : 7, with the words γέγραπται γάρ, (comp. Mark 14 : 27.) Matt. 21 : 45, the passage, chap. 9 : 9, by τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, where the article shows, that Matthew presupposed Zechariah to be well known to all his readers. While, however, the mention of Zechariah might appear to him as unnecessary, it was otherwise with Jeremiah. The fact, that this prophecy was realized in the event before him, and how far it was so, was not so obvious as to render superfluous a hint requiring further investigation. And yet, without this insight, the sense of the prophecy of Zechariah must remain in the highest degree obscure, and its fulfilment in essential points misapprehended.

The result which we have gained is not unimportant. It appears that the apostle precisely in the passage, which the new critics cite as a certain proof of the proposition, that the authors of the New Testament were not free from error, manifests a deeper insight into the sense of the Old Testament prophecy, than all these critics taken together, no one of whom has perceived, that we can just as little interpret the passage of Zechariah, without the aid of Jeremiah, as we can, without that of Daniel, determine what the Lord intended by the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. Indeed, the assumption of

an error is the most convenient for those who abhor labor; and at the same time affords an advantage not to be despised against the literal interpreter; but such proceedings cannot for ever hide the truth, as certainly as it is not the will of the Lord, that one iota of his word should fail. Would that men, if they cannot immediately find out a probable solution, would imitate the modesty of Frischmuth, who, in his treatise *De XXX. Argenteis* in the *Thesaur. Theol. Phil.* I. p. 1041, after a citation of a passage of the Jewish grammarian Ephodæus, says: "*Omnibus modis eo laborandum est, ut irregularitatis demus rationem. Ubi vero eam dare nequimus, satis est nos novisse hoc fieri propter defectum nostrum, minime vero, quod in libris divinis anomalia quædam sit. Id vero ut dicamus, absit.*" Although fully sensible of the inadequacy of his own explanation, he proceeds: "*Quam modestiam si et nos Christiani imitari velimus, difficultatem declinare facile fuerit dicendo, si vel maxime haud ita constet, quomodo Jeremias legatur, ideo tamen necdum sequi, scripturam corruptam esse, vel Evangelistam esse lapsum. Sic satius fuerit aliquam ignorantiam profiteri nostram, quam temere aliquam falsationem admittere.*"

It now remains to show, that the citation of Matthew perfectly coincides with this passage in sense, if not in words. We must here in the first place endeavour to settle the meaning of the words, *Καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου, ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.* We translate, "they received the price of him who was valued, for which they had valued him, on the part of the sons of Israel." We do not supply before *ἀπο τῶν υ. Ἰ.* the pronoun *τινές*, which Fritzsche properly rejects, without however being justified in his extremely forced interpretation. We rather apply here the Hebrew and Arimæan usage, according to which the indefinite third person, which then supplies the place of the passive, is designated by the third person of the plural; comp. the examples in *Ges. Lehrg.* p. 798. Instances out of the New Testament are such passages as Luke 12:20: *τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ*, "they demand," for, "one demands," and this then for "it is demanded." The expression *ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*, "on the part of the sons of Israel," (comp. Winer p. 318, James 1:13, *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι*, "I am tempted of God,") corresponds to מֵעֲלֵיהֶם in Zechariah. The noun is used by Matthew instead of the pronoun, in order to awaken attention to the meanness of the valuation. This was done, not indeed by heathen, but by the covenant people them-

selves, who had received such numberless proofs of the love and mercy of the Lord. The apparent deviation, that in Matthew the receiving of the pieces of silver and the casting of them into the field of the potter are attributed to the leaders of the Jews, in Zechariah on the contrary, to the shepherd, Matthew removes by subjoining at the close the words, *καθὰ συνέταξέ μοι κύριος*, corresponding to וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי in Zechariah. By these words he indicates, that he regards the leaders of the people, not as acting independently, but only as instruments, by which the Lord accomplishes his purposes, so that nothing is wanting to make the coincidence complete.

V. 14. "*Then I broke my second staff, the Allied, to abolish the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.*" Comp. v. 7. We have already had occasion often to remark, that in the representation of future things the images are borrowed from the past. Thus, e. g. chap. 10: 11, the future deliverance is described as a passage through the Red Sea; so likewise as a deliverance from the yoke of the Assyrians and Egyptians, who had long been deprived of their power at the time of Zechariah. In such cases, the usual blending of image and reality properly lies at the foundation. Instead of saying, e. g. "I will deliver Israel as gloriously as before, when I led them through the Red Sea;" the prophet says directly, "The Lord will lead them anew through the Red Sea." Such passages would not have been so grossly misunderstood, if more regard had been paid to the analogy of poetry in general, and particularly that of Christian hymns. When e. g. the singer says, "Only briskly come in, it will not be so deep, the Red Sea will already give place to thee," who can really suppose, that he is on the point of passing the Red Sea? or when it is said, "Egypt, good night," that he has prepared himself for a journey from Egypt to Canaan? Thus also is it here. The most melancholy dissension of the past was that between Judah and Israel, which caused the separation of the two kingdoms, and, continuing afterwards, consumed the energies, which fitted the people to withstand their heathen foes. The prophet now wishes to say, that, after the Lord shall have forsaken the people, the most destructive internal discord will arise among them, even as destructive as the former contention between Judah and Israel. This he expresses by saying directly, "The Lord will abolish the brotherhood between Judah and Israel," altogether the same as his previous declaration, "They will eat the flesh one of another." The fulfilment took place, as has been already remarked, at the time of the

Roman invasion, when the Jews were destroyed by the rage of parties against each other. This is so plain, that it forced itself even upon Abarbanel: "*Quia tempore excidii latrones aucti sunt, et cum amore etiam fraternitas est imminuta in tribu Judah, et insuper inter hos et filios Israelis, sacerdotes et Levitas, qui apud ipsos erant, idcirco hic ait, ad irritum faciendam fraternitatem inter Judam et Israelem.*"

V. 15. "*Then said the Lord to me, take to thee again the vessels of a foolish shepherd.*" Calvin: "*Hic docet propheta, ubi deus abjecerit curam populi, fore aliquam vanam speciem regiminis, sed ex qua facile colligi possit, deum non agere amplius officium pastoris. — Jam se abdicaverat deus munere pastoris, sed postea præfecit et lupos et fures et latrones pastorum loco, cum scil. vellet exequi horribile suum judicium contra Judæos.*" עוֹד, again i. q. "while thou proceedest to symbolize the fortunes of the people." It is obvious, that by the foolish shepherd must be understood not an individual, but the whole body of the wicked rulers, who, after the rejection of the good shepherd, destroyed the people. We are not, however, to refer it to foreign, but domestic leaders. For only against the latter could the divine punishment be threatened, as is done v. 17, because they were at the same time instruments of the punishment and partakers of it, as well as of the horrible apostasy; and indeed of this they were the chief authors, while the former, according to v. 5, were not guilty. That there, in like manner, the domestic rulers under the name of *the shepherds*, are contrasted with the foreign, the buyers and sellers, we have already seen. The truth was perceived by Abendana in the *Spicileg.* to the *Miclal Jophi* of *Sal. Ben Melech*, only that his interpretation is too limited: "*Per pastores nihili, intelliguntur principes latronum, Jochanan, Simeon, et Eliezer.*" The designation of the shepherd, as foolish, instead of ungodly, points out how the leaders of the people, blinded by the divine penal justice, will not perceive that they destroy themselves when they rage against the people. This view of ungodliness, the foolishness connected with it, is often exhibited, comp. e. g. Jer. 4: 22, "For my people is foolish, they have not known me; they are sottish children, and they have no understanding; they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge." — By the implement of the foolish shepherd, more accurately determined by the antithesis with what precedes, may be understood simply the shepherd's staff, or, at the same time also, his other implements. We may

suppose that the implement of the shepherd consisted of a strong staff, armed with iron, wherewith he wounded the sheep, while the good shepherd kept them in order with the soft blows of a thin staff; we can at the same time imagine a perforated shepherd's-pouch, which contained nothing which was useful to the sheep and the shepherd, &c. In any event, the opinion of Bochart (*Hieroz.* I. 455) is to be rejected, that the bad shepherd was not distinguished from the good by any thing external, but only by his actions.

V. 16. "*For behold, I raise up a shepherd in the land, he will not visit that which is perishing, not seek that which has wandered, not heal that which is wounded, not nourish the feeble, and the flesh of the fat ones he will eat, and divide their hoofs.*" Here also the prophet has several passages of Ezekiel and Jeremiah in view. Comp. Ezek. 34: 3, 4, "*The diseased have ye not strengthened,* neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost." Jer. 23: 1, 2, "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! saith the Lord. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Israel against the pastors that feed my people; Ye have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them." The reference to these passages is not merely external, as in general we must regard the dependence of Zechariah on the older prophets, on account of the great power and originality of his genius, as chiefly voluntary. By a righteous divine judgment, the people had been punished before the exile by bad rulers; Jeremiah and Ezekiel had promised them deliverance from these; and this had actually happened after the exile, particularly at the time of Zechariah, when Zerubbabel and Joshua guided the people in a truly paternal manner. Zechariah however announces, that in future the same cause would produce the same effect, and indeed in a higher degree. — כִּי at the beginning is explained by the circumstance, that the reason why a symbolical action was performed, is the same which the action signified. The particulars of the verse are admirably illustrated by Bochart, *Hieroz.* I. p. 445. הַנַּעַר, not with the Hebrew interpreters and Calvin, ("*Oves longo usu sese continent, ita ut non aberrent ab aliis, sed agni magis lasciviunt, et facile huc et illuc disperguntur,*") "the young," — נַעַר never occurs of animals, — but "the dispersed." In the sense *to shake,* the verb occurs, Neh. 5: 13; in the Talmud it occurs especially of

the wandering flocks of sheep, comp. Buxtorf, s. v. In the Arabic الشعر, according to Gigg.: *De viro, instabilis, sedem mutans.* — הַנִּצָּבָה לֹא יְכַלְכֵּל, after Michaelis, Rosenmüller explains by, "*Qui restitant præ lassitudine et morbo, non portabit.*" But the verb כָּלַכֵּל never means *to carry*, but always *to sustain* and *nourish*. Others, "That which stands upright and firm, he will not nourish." Vulg.: "*Id quod stat non nutriet.*" Bochart: "*Stans opponitur jacenti et ex morbo decumbenti. Nam ut confractis et ægris medela opus est, sic cibo et alimentis stantibus et valentibus, quo bona illa habitudo conservetur.*" It is better, however, as appears from the parallel passages of Ezekiel, to combine the two interpretations; "That which continues to stand, and that which, from hunger and feebleness, cannot move from its place, (to this sense we are led by Niphal, which designates suffering,) he will not provide for, to strengthen it by food and care." The expression, "he will divide their hoofs," does not indicate, as most interpreters suppose, the extreme cruelty, but the extreme greediness of the shepherd, which has indeed, for its attendant, cruelty against his sheep; it is a climax of, "he will eat," &c. He will even break the hoofs apart, that no fibre of the flesh should be lost.

V. 17. "*Wo to the unworthy shepherd, who forsakes the flock, a sword comes upon his arm, and upon his right eye; his arm shall be altogether palsied, his right eye altogether blind.*" Calvin: "*Hoc versu docet propheta, etiamsi deus merito tam gravem vindictam infligat Judæis, tamen pastores ipsos non impune elapsuros, et hoc modo admonet, etiam in rebus illis tam confusis et perditis sibi tamen aliquam fore fœderis sui memoriam.*" As the object of the punishment, the arm and the right eye are mentioned by way of individualization, as the two members of the body, which the good shepherd chiefly employs for the care and protection of his flock, but which the bad shepherd most shamefully abuses to its destruction. The arm the organ of strength, the right eye the organ of prudence. An apparent difficulty here arises, from the circumstance, that two punishments, inconsistent with each other, are mentioned for each member; first, for both, the sword; then, for the arm, palsy, (Calvin: "*Arescet brachium, h. e. vigor ejus ita defluet, ut sit quasi lignum putridum*"); for the eye, dimness. But on a closer examination this difficulty vanishes. The particular punishments serve here only to individualize the idea of punishment in general, and the prophet combines several, in order to exhibit the greatness of the punish-

ment, and consequently the greatness also of the crime. He could do this the more readily since the shepherd is not an individual, but a collective body. To remove this difficulty, two interpretations equally untenable have been invented. Jahn takes the חֶרֶב in the sense *ariditas*, appealing to Deuteronomy 28 : 22, where, however, this sense is in like manner arbitrarily assumed. Rosenmüller after the Chaldee, and Jarchi, suppose, that the threatening of punishment commences with the words, "His arm will wither," and that the preceding belongs to the description of the crime: "*Dicitur brachium et oculus mali pastoris gladio instructus, quod aciem oculorum malo animo et nocendi cupido intendit.*" Both suppositions however are refuted by the comparison of two parallel passages. The first, Jer. 50 : 35 – 38, "A sword upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon their princes, and upon their wise men. A drought upon their waters, that they dry up." — The second, below, chap. 13 : 7, "Sword awake against my shepherd." Remarkable is the double *yod paragog.* in the verse before us, exactly as in Jer. 22 : 23. It is frequent only in the most ancient writings, and in the latest from imitation; in the intervening writers, only in rare examples, as Ps. 110 : 4, Is. 1 : 21; comp. Ewald, p. 376. Perhaps also the *yod* in אֱוֹלִי, v. 15, can be taken as *paragogicum;* there would then be here a trace of a decidedly later usage, to append the *yod*, originally an outward designation of the *stat. constr.*, in other cases also as a mere *paragoge.* Still we may take it with Gesenius (*Thes.* s. v.), as an adjective ending, though to this it is an objection, that אֱוֹלִי as an adjective form of אֱוִיל, as *fool*, and *foolish*, never occurs elsewhere, and that the twofold use of the *yod parag.* in the verse before us is in favor of assuming it there also.

Chap. 12 : 1. — 13 : 6.

The mournful prospect is here again followed by a joyful one. A totally different scene presents itself to our view. The people of the Lord in the conflict with all nations of the earth, feeble in themselves, but strong in the Lord, everywhere come off victorious, v. 1 – 9. The Lord has broken their hard heart, and given them grace to

repent, so that, with bitter distress, they regret the wickedness which they have committed against him, v. 10 – 14. In him they have now the forgiveness of their sins, chap. 13 : 1, and this produces an upright striving after sanctification, and the avoiding of all ungodliness, v. 2 – 6.

The interpreters are divided in reference to the time of the fulfilment of this prophecy, as well as its subject. With respect to the former, several, at the head of whom is Grotius, suppose a reference to the times of the Maccabees. But this supposition is for several reasons altogether untenable. It is contradicted by the relation to the foregoing chapter. The reception of the people of God here described, stands in plain contrast with the rejection of them there; and, if the latter belongs to the time after the appearing of Christ, the former cannot be placed in the time before his coming. This is also confirmed by the comparison of chap. 12 : 10. The penitential and believing looking upon the crucified Messiah there predicted, leads us beyond the time of the Maccabees to that of the Messiah, with which also the characteristics given at chap. 13, the forgiveness of sins, and the general striving after holiness, taken by themselves, and compared with the parallel passages, can alone agree. Lastly, in the former prophecy, referring to the times of the Maccabees, one particular people, the Greeks, are mentioned as hostile to the covenant people, chap. 9 : 13; here, on the contrary, all the nations of the earth appear as their enemies; a sure proof, that we must seek the fulfilment not in the past, which presents nothing of the sort, but in the future, and that the prophecy is analogous to those of earlier prophets, which, as Joel chap. 4, and Ezek. chap. 38, 39, (comp., as respects the latter, however, the introduction to chap. 14,) relate in like manner to the last great struggle against the kingdom of God, to the last great victory of the Lord over his enemies. Notwithstanding the untenableness of this view, it has still some foundation in truth. As in general the chief events under the Old Testament are typical of those under the New Testament, — of which we have one remarkable example in Zechariah himself, chap. 6 : 9 sq., where the Jews dwelling in Babylonia, cut off from the sanctuary, but still contributing to rebuild it, are represented as a type of the distant heathen nations, who, in the Messianic time, should promote the building up of the kingdom of God; as also in the second part of Isaiah, where the return from the exile is so constantly regarded as a type of the future return of the heathen nations

from the captivity of sin and error, that it is often difficult to decide what belongs to the type, and what to the antitype, — so also the splendid deliverance of the people of God from their oppressors, through the Maccabees, typified their future last and great deliverance. Consequently it was represented under images borrowed from the former, so that since we are not here aided by a comparison of the fulfilment, it is difficult, and in part impossible to distinguish what belongs to the figurative drapery, and what to the subject.

The other diversity relates to the subject of the prophecy. The view which considers the Christian church as such is very ancient. Jerome designates it as the general and peculiarly *Christian*, in opposition to the Jewish. "*Alii Judæorum putant, jam hæc ex parte completa a Zorobabel usque ad Cn. Pompejum, qui primus Romanorum Judæam cepit et templum, quam historiam scribit Josephus. Alii vero, quando Hierusalem fuerit instaurata in fine mundi esse complenda, quod sibi cum ἡλειμμένῳ suo, quem supra stultum pastorem legimus, miserabilis gens Judæa promittit. — Alii autem, h. e. nos, qui Christi censemur nomine, in ecclesia usque ad finem mundi quotidie expleri et explenda memoramus.*" So also Cyril, Mark, and many others. But that this interpretation, in the sense in which it is for the most part delivered, is inadmissible, needs no detailed proof drawn from the contents of the prophecy. Only the interpreters of the prophets, not the prophets themselves, know any thing of a spiritual Israel, in contradiction to a natural. This view can obtain our concurrence only when so modified, that the covenant people here signify that portion of Israel, who received the manifested Messiah with faith, and in whose bosom the heathen nations were embraced, instead of independently, and on equal grounds, uniting with them in one church. The conflicting view will then be, that the subject of the prophecy is not in general the Church of the New Covenant, whose original stock consisted of the first-fruits of Israel, but the church of the New Testament in the last ages, when the *whole* people of the Old Testament, freed by the divine mercy from the judgment of obduracy inflicted upon them, will again be received into the kingdom of God, and form its central point. This last view, adopted among others by Vitringa, *Observv.* s. l. II. c. 9, p. 172, Michaelis, Dathe, and others, has so much in its favor, that its rejection can hardly be explained, except from an aversion to the opinion of a future restoration of the whole people

of Israel to their ancient gracious relation to the Lord. In appearance, there is indeed much against this; but we must not therefore be led to set aside, by a forced interpretation, the plain declarations of Scripture, which teach it, not merely of the Old Testament, but also of the New Testament, not merely of the apostles, particularly of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, but also of the Lord himself, (comp. Matt. 23 : 39 : *Λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν· οὐ μή με ἴδητε ἀπάρτι, ἕως ἂν εἴπητε· Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.*) The principle proof is found in chap. 12 : 10 sq. According to this passage, those who now experience the powerful help of the Lord are the same who have formerly put him to death; with the former *national guilt*, as it had been represented, chap. 11, and the consequent punishment, the *national mourning* on account of it, is here contrasted with the strongest expressions of its universality, which excludes every reference to those individual Israelites, who, immediately after the crucifixion of the Lord, smote upon their breasts.

We must here still direct attention to the accurate agreement between the first and second part of Zechariah, which has been already intimated. Chap. 1 – 4, exactly corresponds with chap. 9 and 10. Both represent the blessings, which should be conferred upon the believing part of the covenant people, until the manifestation of the Messiah, chiefly however through that event. Chap. 5 corresponds with chap. 11. Both represent the divine judgments, which should come upon the unbelieving and ungodly part of the covenant people, after their ungodliness had most signally manifested itself in the rejection of the Messiah. Chap. 6 : 1 – 8, describes briefly what is more fully detailed in the prophecy before us, and in chap. 14, God's protection of Israel, and the punishment of their ungodly enemies, when they have again become the people of God. What a decisive ground for the genuineness of Zechariah this remarkable parallelism furnishes, is obvious.

V. 1. "*The burden of the word of the Lord upon Israel. Saith the Lord, who stretches out the heavens, and establishes the earth, and forms the spirit of man within him.*" — The superscription of this prophecy has been violently misinterpreted. The usual interpretation is that of Cocceius: "*Prolatio verbi Jehovæ de Israele.*"

But the following reasons may be urged against this. 1. We have already seen (p. 77 sqq.), that מַשָּׂא never signifies *declaration*, but always *burden*, and occurs only in the superscription of prophecies announcing adversity, and in indeed in such a manner, that the proper name standing therewith in the *stat. const.*, or connected with it by the prepositions בְּ or עַל, designates the object of the threatening prophecy, or of the judgments threatened. It is therefore entirely arbitrary, when מַשָּׂא is taken here, in this single passage, in the sense *prophecy*, and also when עַל is taken in the sense *de*, especially as it immediately occurs, v. 2, twice as a designation of a burdensome calamity. 2. Israel cannot here be a designation of the covenant people. For in the whole prophecy which follows, it is plain, that this designation is diligently avoided. The discourse, throughout, is only of Jerusalem and Judah. This plainly indicates, not the identity of Israel and the covenant people, but a difference between them. Another explanation, that of Mark, "a burden of the word of the Lord, in or for Israel," and, as it appears, that of Rückert also, who translates, "burden of the word of the Lord in Israel," removes, of the abovementioned difficulties, only that which concerns the import of the word מַשָּׂא, while it is liable to others at least equally great, inasmuch as, the meaning *burden* being assumed, the separation of עַל from מַשָּׂא is extremely forced, and the explanation, "a prophecy of the Lord in Israel which burdens his enemies," is certainly in the highest degree unnatural. It only remains, therefore, especially when we compare the entirely analogous superscription, chap. 9 : 1, as well as the almost verbally similar one, Mal. 3 : 1, to adopt the supposition, that Israel is here the object of the threatening prophecy. Hence it follows, that Israel cannot be a designation of the covenant people; since for them the prophecy is not of a threatening, but consoling character. Of all the interpreters only Ribera, as far as we know, perceived the truth: "*Israel significare puto Judæas (?), inimicos ecclesiæ, et ceteros ejus persecutores.*" The enemies of the kingdom of God are certainly those whose overthrow is predicted in the prophecy itself, they must therefore be those also whose overthrow is predicted in the superscription. The ground of this designation, which at first sight appears strange, was twofold. 1. The etymology of the name. This was very significant in reference to the object of Zechariah. *Israel* signifies *God's wrestler*, he who has wrestled, or still does wrestle with God, comp. Gen. 32 : 29, Hos. 12 : 4, where, in allusion to

the two names *Jacob* and *Israel*, it is said, בַּבֶּטֶן עָקַב אֶת־אָחִיו יִבָּאוֹנוֹ שָׂרָה אֶת־אֱלֹהִים. 2. The relation of the kingdom of Judah to the kingdom of Israel was a type of the future relation of the kingdom of God to its enemies. The kingdom of Israel, by the worship of images and idols, had been guilty of an apostasy from God, which deserved to be punished, and was constantly endeavouring, partly alone, partly in alliance with the heathenish Syrians, to overthrow Judah, the tribe which the Lord had chosen, and where he had built his sanctuary, (comp. Ps. 78: 10, 11, 67, 68.) Their later exile was the righteous punishment of this hostility against God and his kingdom, comp. 2 Kings 17, Is. 7: 7, 8: 6, 9: 7 sq. That the prophet in the choice of the name *Israel* had in view, besides the etymology, this allusion also, appears from his employing Judah and Jerusalem throughout the prophecy, as a designation of the covenant people, while elsewhere he frequently mentions Judah and Israel or Ephraim after one another. — The predicates attached to the name of God, as is very frequently the case in the older prophets, particularly in the second part of Isaiah, serve to suppress the doubt of the fulfilment of the promise arising from present appearances, by pointing to the omnipotence of its author. Theodoret: *Οὐκ ἐγὼ, φησὶν ὁ προφήτης, ταῦτα πρὸς ὑμᾶς διεξέρχομαι, ἀλλ' ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ποιητὴς καὶ δημιουργός, ὃ ἔτι νῦν ἐν ταῖς νηδύσι τὰ σώματα διαπλάττων, καὶ ψυχὰς σὺν αὐτοῖς δημιουργεῖσθαι κελεύων, οὗτος δι' ἐμοῦ φθέγγεται.* Still better Calvin: "*Ubi de re creditu difficili agitur, nisi occurrat nobis immensa dei potentia, friget, quidquid nobis promittitur. Deus ergo, ut fidem suis promissionibus acquirat, oculos nostros in cœlum attollit, et jubet hoc mirabile opificium diligenter aspicere; deinde convertit nos ad terram, ubi etiam inæstimabilis ejus virtus apparet. Tertio revocat nos ad considerationem propriæ naturæ.*" What is here indirectly, is directly, chap. 8: 6, expressed in the words: "If it shall be wonderful in the eyes of the remnant of this people in those days, will it therefore also be wonderful in my eyes? saith the Lord Almighty." This introductory declaration should have been more carefully considered by those interpreters, who have mistaken the true explanation, because their eye was fixed on the visible appearance. The participles נֹטֶה and יֹסֵד are not, as several interpreters suppose, to be referred exclusively to the past. In opposition to the cheerless view, according to which the works of God, after they have been once created, stand related to him as a house to its builder, their preservation is in a certain respect always re-

garded in Scripture as a continued creation. God daily stretches out the heavens anew, daily lays the foundation of the earth, which, if not restrained by his power, would wander from its course and be shattered in pieces. The last predicate also refers not merely to the original creation of the human soul, but at the same time to the continual creating and sustaining influence which God exerts upon it. The formation of the spirit of man is here rendered especially prominent among the many works of the Divine Omnipotence, because this is the ground of the absolute and constant influence exerted upon it by him who turns the hearts of kings as the waterbrooks. How should not the Creator of the spirits of all men, the God of the spirits of all flesh, as he is called in the same respect in Numbers 16 : 22, 27 : 16, be able to strike all the horsemen of the enemy with madness, as it is said, v. 4, or to fill the leaders of his people according to v. 6, with sacred courage! In a manner precisely similar is the omnipotence of God, Ps. 33 : 15, founded on his being the Former of the hearts of all men. The same three predicates, Is. 42 : 5, are joined with one another. More remote is the reference which Calvin gives to the last predicate: "*Sentimus nos vivere; corpus per se corebit omni motu et vigore, nisi intus animetur: anima, quæ corpus vegetat, invisibilis est. Quum ergo experientia nobis demonstret, virtutem dei, quæ tamen non est oculis conspicua, cur non exspectabimus, quæ promittit, etiamsi eventus nobis incredibilis videtur, et omnes sensus nostros excedit?*" בְּקִרְבּוֹ is well explained by him thus: "*Quum dicit* in medio *ejus, intelligit spiritum habitare intus: quia scimus corpus nostrum esse instar tabernaculi.*"

V. 2. "*Behold! I make Jerusalem for a threshold of shaking to all nations round about, and also upon Judah will it be, in the siege against Jerusalem.*" According to the usual explanation the first half of this verse is understood as predicting prosperity for Jerusalem, and translated, "Behold, I make Jerusalem a basin or cup of intoxication for all the nations round about." The sense, according to this explanation is best unfolded by Tarnov: "*Ego eam dispositurus sum, ut pelvem soporiferam, seu vas ingens, ad quod cum omnes populi sunt rabido conatu accessuri, et sitim extincturi furenter accurrunt, suo malo degustent, siquidem potio in illa est soporifera, qua hausta gignetur animi tanta perturbatio, ut homines se ipsos et sua perdant, in perniciem suam, velut ebrii mente capti, ruentes præcipites.*" The oldest authority for this translation is the Chal-

dee, which translates, " *Poculum, quod plenum est vino inebriante.*" It has been attempted to establish it by appealing to several alleged parallel passages, where, in like manner, the subject of discourse is *a cup of intoxication*, כּוֹס הַתַּרְעֵלָה, Is. 51 : 17 – 22, or *wine of intoxication*, יֵין הַתַּרְעֵלָה, Ps. 60 : 5; though these and all similar passages are not entirely analogous to the one before us, according to the abovementioned interpretation. Everywhere else the Divine judgment is the cup of intoxication, which is extended to the nations; here it is Jerusalem. This interpretation is liable to the following objections. 1. That סַף has the meaning *cup*, is incapable of proof, and indeed improbable, since it does not harmonize with its usual import, *threshold*. This supposition has been grounded especially on Exodus 12 : 22; but Gousset, *Lex.* s. v. has clearly shown, that סַף there means not *basin*, but *threshold*. The remaining passages, 2 Sam. 17 : 28, 1 Kings 7 : 50, 2 Kings 12 : 14, and Jer. 52 : 19, merely show, in general, that there were certain vessels, which bore the figurative names of the *thresholds*, סַפּוֹת, סִפּוֹת, or סְפָפִים. But neither does this name itself (which surely presupposes some sort of resemblance to a *threshold*) imply a *cup*, nor its connexion in both the passages of Kings, with knives, in Jeremiah with tongs; while the contrary is rather implied by its separation from the basins and bowls in like manner there mentioned. 2. That תַּרְעֵלָה imports intoxication does not justify us in attributing to רָעַל the same meaning. The sense *concussion*, according to the import of the verb in Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac, is more obvious. 3. The chief argument, however, is furnished by the second half of the verse. If this cannot be understood otherwise than as threatening, without the greatest caprice, so must the first necessarily be, according to this interpretation, not consoling, but threatening, and the more so since the *threatening* against Judah is connected with the foregoing declaration concerning Jerusalem by וְגַם. The whole first verse must be employed, as in chap. 14, with the description of the distress of the covenant people, and that of the deliverance must be subjoined. We follow therefore without hesitation the translation of the Seventy, who render סַף־רַעַל by *ὡς πρόθυρα σαλευόμενα*, and regard as certainly correct, what Theodoret remarks in explanation of the words: *Εὐάλωτον, φησὶ, καὶ εὐκαταγώνιστον πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι ἀποκαταστήσω τήνδε τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἐοικυῖαν δείξω προθύροις σαλευομένοις, καὶ καταφέρεσθαι μέλλουσιν, ὥστε τοὺς πολεμίους τῆς ἐμῆς προνοίας γεγυμνωμένην ὁρῶντας ἐπελθεῖν καὶ πολιορκῆσαι καὶ τὰ φυόμενα ἐντεῦθεν ἐπα-*

γαγεῖν κακά. There lies at the foundation the comparison of Jerusalem with a building, which totters throughout as soon as its threshold is shaken. Thus in Is. 6 : 4, the bases of the thresholds tremble; in Amos 9 : 1, the entire shaking of the Theocracy is signified by the shaking of the thresholds of the temple. — In the designation of enemies there is a climax, —here all the nations round about, v. 3, first all nations, afterwards all the nations of the earth. The strongest designation is reserved until the divine aid has been announced. In the contrast with this, it was no longer terrible to the covenant people and the divine omnipotence was thereby rendered the more manifest. — The second part has ever been a *crux interpretum*, plainly because the false interpretation of the first has prevented them from arriving at the truth here. According to one of the most prevalent interpretations the sense is, " Judah also, compelled by enemies, shall take part in the siege of Jerusalem." Thus the Chaldee: " *Atque etiam illos domus Judæ adducent populi per manum violentorum in obsidionem adversus Hierusalem.*" Jerome : " *Sed et Judas, obsessa Hierusalem, est captus a gentibus, et, in illarum transiens societatem, cogetur obsidere metropolin suam.*" Grotius: " *Rem miram dicit, fore ut etiam ex Judæis sint, qui se in Hieros. hostiliter gerant, quod factum nunquam antea fuerat.*" The only two plausible philological defences of these interpretations (those which, with Dathe, regard עַל as superfluous, are not taken into consideration) are that of Michaelis, whom Rosenmüller follows : " *Sed et super Judam erit* (*h. e. etiam Judæ incumbet, s. etiam Juda tenebitur vel cogetur esse*) *in obsidione*," &c. ; and that of Kimchi and others : " *Sed et super Judam erit* (*calix vertiginis*), *cum cogetur venire in obsidionem contra Hierusalem.*" But it is an objection common to both, that there is not the slightest trace in what follows, of a participation of Judah in the siege of Jerusalem, and that Judah rather appears as the ally of Jerusalem, even as he by whose victory, gained through the help of the Lord, the city should be delivered. The defenders of these interpretations are obliged in the sequel to invent a multitude of historical circumstances of which not the smallest trace, but even the opposite, is contained in the text. Nor is any thing effected by appealing to chap. 14 : 14, as a conflict of Judah against Jerusalem is there mentioned, only according to a false interpretation, but, even if this were not so, the prophecy must furnish its own explanation. This objection lies with the more force against the explanation of Kimchi, since, according to him, Judah

should experience a severe divine punishment on account of his forced participation in the siege, while nevertheless, in what follows, nothing but prosperity is announced to him. Against the interpretation of Michaelis, there is the special objection, that his understanding of עַל, though not of itself to be absolutely rejected, (comp. Ezek. 45 : 17, Ps. 56 : 13,) is yet here refuted by the manifest parallelism of Judah and Jerusalem, which does not admit that עַל should be understood differently in the two members. The explanation of Kimchi rests on an unfounded interpretation of סָךְ רַעַל. The correct one is : "Also upon Judah will it come in the siege of Jerusalem." The sense has already been perceived by Luther, "It will concern Judah also when Jerusalem is besieged." Burk : "*Non agitur tantum de urbe regia expugnanda, sed de tota gente Judaica exstirpanda.*" Grammar does not require us to supply with Schmid and Tarnov at יִהְיֶה "each one of them." The subject lies rather indirectly in what precedes, that Jerusalem would be to the enemies a threshold of concussion, and in what follows, that they would besiege it. From this the idea of adversity, of a hostile siege, may be readily derived, and the more so since the sentence is connected with the foregoing by וְגַם. — The antithesis of Judah and Jerusalem seems here to be that between the lower and the more respectable portion of the covenant people, just as v. 8, in Jerusalem itself a similar antithesis is presented by the house of David and the other inhabitants. The type of this relation was furnished by that of Jerusalem, the civil and religious capital to the rest of Judah, which looked up to it with wonder, (comp. e. g. Ps. 122,) in the past and present. The strictly literal understanding of this antithesis, which is also found in the first part, chap. 1 : 12, 2 : 16, is particularly unsupported in Zechariah on account of his uniformly figurative and typical character. The antithesis here serves only to prepare the way for the following annunciation, that the Lord, in order that the deliverance might more clearly appear as his work, would interpose first for the most feeble and helpless portion of the covenant people.

V. 3. "*And it shall come to pass the same day, that I will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all the nations; all who lift it up shall bruise and cut themselves; and there shall be gathered together against her all the nations of the earth.*" (Rückert.) With this verse the prediction of prosperity begins, with which the additional expression, "it shall come to pass in this day," perfectly coincides.

The sense is aptly developed by Jerome : "*Ponam Hierusalem cunctis gentibus quasi gravissimum lapidem sublevandum ; levabunt quidem eam, et pro virium varietate vastabunt*" (not altogether correct, since Jerusalem in this whole prophecy appears indeed as sorely pressed, but not as captured, comp. particularly v. 5, which is different from chap. 14, where the help is delayed until after the capture), "*sed necesse est, ut, dum levatur, in ipso nixu et elevatione ponderis gravissimus lapis scissuram aliquam vel rasuram in levantium corporibus derelinquat.*" The image of a heavy stone, which inflicts dislocations and bruises upon those, who, overrating their strength, raise it up, ("*damnum non sentiens ipse magnum damnum iis affert,*" Mark,) is in itself so plain, that there is no occasion to assume, with most interpreters, a direct reference to a gymnastic exercise practised in Palestine in the time of Jerome, according to his account, which has already been too often copied. — In the words, *and they assemble*, &c., the prophet describes once more in the strongest language the danger, in order that in contrast with it the deliverance might appear the more wonderful, and at the same time that the believers might not be discouraged. Calvin : "*Amplificationem in se continet hoc membrum, ut fideles perstarent invicta constantia ad bene sperandum, quamvis hostium multitudine viderent se obrui.*"

V. 4. "*In that day, saith the Lord, I will smite all horses with fright, and their riders with madness ; and upon the house of Judah will I open mine eyes, and all horses of the nations will I smite with blindness.*" Calvin : "*Intelligit propheta, quidquid robustum fuerit, tamen facile posse vinci divinitus. — Scimus robur militare esse in equis et equitibus : equos autem dicit fore attonitos : equites vero ipsos quasi correptos insania, ut scil. se ipsos quasi conficiant, neque possint nocere ecclesiæ. Confirmat igitur, quod nuper dixit, quamvis totus mundus conspiret contra ecclesiam, tamen satis virtutis esse in Deo, ut omnes impetus vel procul repellat, vel conterat. Et ideo stuporem, amentiam, cæcitatem ponit, ut discant fideles deum occultis modis posse hostes suos vel perdere vel profligare. Quamvis ergo deus non pugnet exertis gladiis, neque utatur communi bellandi more, dicit tamen propheta, instructum esse aliis, mediis ut hostes suos prosternat.*" The horsemen as the flower of the hostile army are mentioned also, chap. 10 : 5. What the smiting of the horsemen with madness imports, is exemplified 2 Kings 6 : 18, where the Lord, in answer to the prayer of Elisha, so blinds his enemies, that, instead

of seizing him, they rush upon their own destruction. The opening of the eyes, a designation of the divine care; God appeared to have closed his eyes as long as he gave up his people to affliction. The opening of the eyes of God on the house of Judah stands in contrast with the smiting of the enemies' horses with blindness, and is the more appropriate, since he upon whom God opens his eyes now sees clearly himself, while before he groped in darkness, comp. Is. 59 : 10. The *house* of Judah (not bare Judah, as in the preceding and following context, where Judah stands in the antithesis with Jerusalem,) seems here to comprehend the whole covenant people. The house of Judah is elsewhere frequently called the kingdom of Judah, in contrast with the house or kingdom of Israel; and that the prophet here also has this antithesis in view is evident from the foregoing typical designation of the enemies by Israel.

V. 5. "*And the princes of Judah say in their hearts: Strong for me are the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the Lord, the Almighty, their God.*" Remarkable here, as in chap. 9 : 7, is the use of the noun אַלּוּף, of princes and leaders of the covenant people. This word occurs besides only as a designation of the Idumean princes of tribes, comp. Gen. 36 : 15 sq., Exod. 15 : 15, 1 Chron. 1 : 51 sqq. Several lexicographers cite indeed in favor of the more general meaning, besides the above passages, that of Jeremiah 13 : 21; but Schultens, *Animadvv. Phil.* on Jer. 13 : 21, has so clearly proved that אַלּוּף here has not the meaning *prince*, but, as elsewhere also in Jeremiah (3 : 4), that of *friend*, that nothing farther need be said.* This entirely peculiar use of אַלּוּף in Zechariah is not unimportant. 1. It refutes the hypothesis of those, who assume that chap. 9 is the work of a different author from that before us. 2. It furnishes a testimony for the composition of the second part in the period after the exile, and therefore for its genuineness. Such an idiom, — much the same as if we should generally use *Margrave* for *Prince*, — can be explained only from his learning the language out of the more ancient writings, which, as we have already seen, Zechariah constantly imitates. — אֲמָצָה is to be understood as a noun, since no other interpretation can be grammatically justified, or give

* "Et tu docuisti eos amicos esse contra te, in caput. Amarulentissimus est sarcasmus. 'Tu Babylonios tibi amicos esse docuisti, scil. לְרֹאשׁ ut in caput tibi sint, tibique imperent.' Hoc cum præcedenti interrogatione, 'Quid dices,' mire convenit, quo ostenditur, aliud expectasse a Babyloniis Judæos, quam ut se opprimerent."

an appropriate sense. The passage before us receives light from v. 6, 7. It is there made prominent, that God would first deliver the feeblest portion of the covenant people most exposed to hostile assaults, designated by the inhabitants of the province in contrast with those of the capital, and give them the most splendid victory over the common enemy, in order that the former splendor of Jerusalem might not receive by the new advantage such an accession, that Judah would be thereby entirely eclipsed. This annunciation now in the verse before us is prepared for, by its being declared how little Judah stood in expectation of such prosperity and honor, and how in quiet lowliness and modesty he expected his prosperity only from the capital, which was peculiarly favored of God and standing under his special protection. His own confession of lowliness makes his subsequent glorification more manifestly a work of God, who gives grace to the humble. There is therefore no ground, with Tarnov and Michaelis, ("*Fortitudo est mihi et habitatoribus Hieros. non in nobis, sed in Jehovah,*") arbitrarily to assume an *asyndeton.* Still less, however, with Gesenius, (*Thes.* s. v. אָתָה,) after the example of Dathe, is a change of the text to be hazarded: "*Tu meo periculo* (indeed) *repone cum duobus codd.* לִישָׁבִי, *et verte: Præsidium est habitatoribus Hieros. apud Jehovam. Chaldæus: Inventa est salus habitatoribus.*" This proposed emendation is destitute of all external authority. The Chaldee paraphrast cannot be cited in its favor, because it is obvious, that, not understanding the construction, he is only endeavouring to *conjecture* the sense, and translates altogether loosely. All other ancient translators have the לִי. Of two manuscripts which are said not to have it, — in the mass of *Codd.* of no importance, — one is moreover uncertain, comp. De Rossi on the passage. But, what is of chief importance, the supposed emendation gives no suitable sense. That Jerusalem should afford protection to the whole land, not that it should find deliverance for itself alone, must have been earnestly desired by the princes of Judah. — לִי for לָנוּ is explained by the fact, that the princes of Judah speak in the name of the whole people, just as chap. 7 : 3. The ambassadors of the covenant people ask, "Shall *I* weep as I have done? בְּ designates the Lord as the ground and the source of the strength. The Jehovah of Hosts, κύριος ὁ παντοκράτωρ, points to the omnipotence of God, "their God," to his will to help, grounded on his covenant relation to his people.

V. 6. "*In that day will I make the princes of Judah as a fire*

from under wood, and as a torch of fire under sheaves; and they shall devour, on the right hand and on the left, all the nations round about, and Jerusalem continues to sit on her throne at Jerusalem." How far this verse is to be understood figuratively and how far literally, must first be learnt from the fulfilment, which it would be rashness to attempt to anticipate. Considering the constant practice of Zechariah to employ what belongs to the Old Testament, as an image and type of the New Testament, the figurative interpretation cannot be rejected beforehand. The substance would then be only, "the victory of the covenant people over their enemies"; the special designations belong only to the type in itself considered. Still a remark of Vitringa on Apoc. 19: 19, where exactly the same representation occurs, so that this cannot be regarded in any event as peculiar to the Old Testament, and belonging to its inferior character, deserves all regard: "*Deus non pugnat cum hostibus suis corporali modo; nec Christus etiam suæ ecclesiæ rex. Quando tamen sua curat providentia, ut ecclesia nanciscatur vindices suæ causæ, per quos ipse hostes suos dejicit et prosternit: tum vero ipse,* spirituali *quidem modo pugnans, vincit etiam* corporaliter: *suntque effecta victoriæ Christi ejusmodi in casu per orbem manifesta.*" The consolation afforded the church by this promise, however it may be understood in reference to the outward circumstances, is developed by Calvin: "*Transfertur ad ecclesiam opus ipsius dei, quemadmodum aliis in locis. Tenenda est hæc prophetæ doctrina, quamvis hostes nostri turmatim in nos ruant, tamen fore lignorum congeriem et nos fore similes fornaci: quia etiamsi in nobis nullæ sint vires, dominus tamen occulta sua gratia efficiet, ut solo accessu sese consumant hostes nostri.*" — The last member is erroneously interpreted by most commentators: "Jerusalem dwells still in her place at Jerusalem." It is a mistake to suppose, that תַּחַת ever means place, comp. p. 57. The phrase, "under herself," shows, that יָשַׁב is to be taken in the sense *to sit*. Jerusalem is here, as usual, personified as a matron. She continues to sit on the throne, (the verb יָשַׁב, in like manner, of sitting on the throne, chap. 6: 13,) from which her enemies thought to cast her down. Explanatory in every respect is the passage, Is. 47: 1, where the opposite is said of Babylon: "Descend and sit in the dust, thou virgin daughter, Babylon; sit on the earth without a throne, thou daughter of the Chaldeans." The phrase, "under herself," is here i. q. on that, which she had hitherto had under herself, on her throne. This passage of Isaiah

at the same time, throws light on a number of other passages, in which the entirely unsupported meaning, *to be inhabited*, is attributed to the verb יָשַׁב by lexicographers (comp. e. g. Winer, s. v.) and commentators (e. g. Gesenius on Is. 13:20). In all these passages a personification of the cities lies at the foundation; as long as they remain unconquered, they appear as proud princesses sitting on their throne. So e. g. Is. 13:20, לֹא תֵשֵׁב לָנֶצַח וְלֹא תִשָּׁכֵן עַד דּוֹר וָדוֹר, "She will never more sit and never again dwell." The error of the translation by "she will not be inhabited," is the more obvious here as well as Jer. 50:39, since we are then compelled to understand the verb שָׁכַן in an intransitive sense, which never occurs. This difference of explanation has in many passages an important bearing on the sense. A land or a city cannot sit (*lie down*), without thereby becoming entirely uninhabited, as e. g. we cannot infer from "Askalon will not sit," chap. 9:5, an entire depopulation of the city, but only its deep decline, in exact parallelism with the preceding member, "Gaza loses its king."

V. 7. "*And the Lord will help the tents of Judah first: in order that the splendor of the house of David, and the splendor of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, may not exalt itself above Judah.*" The tents of Judah here stand in plain antithesis with the capital. A similar antithesis occurs wherever the tents of Judah or Israel are mentioned, comp. e. g. 2 Sam. 20:1, "A wicked man said: we have no part in David; every one to his tents, O Israel;" v. 22, "And they dispersed themselves from the city, each one to his tent." 1 Kings 8:66, "Solomon dismissed the people and they went to their tents." Judges 20:8, "And the whole people rose up as one man, saying: We will not go each one to his tent." The use of the term *tents* for *houses*, in these passages, is occasioned by the effort to lessen that which was dispersed and scattered, in contrast with that which was concentrated; just as among us every one, who inhabits a respectable house can say, "I retire from the capital into my hut;" and we need not, with J. D. Michaelis and Winer, find a relic of the old nomadic times. In this passage, however, the designation seems to have a special subordinate reference to the helplessness of Judah, and thus to make more emphatic the expression, "And the Lord helps." Calvin: "*Per tabernacula meo judicio intelligit propheta tuguria, quæ non possunt tueri suos hospites vel inquilinos. — Est hic tacita comparatio inter tuguria et urbes munitas.*" Parallel is Ezek. 38:11, "And thou shalt say, I

will go up to the land of unwalled villages; I will go to them that are at rest, that dwell safely, all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates." The expression, "in order not," &c., refers to *first*, and not to the divine help, which should be granted to Jerusalem, as well as to Judah, and indeed through the latter. There is a good reason why תִּפְאֶרֶת is not repeated before *Judah*. Burk: "*Simplex Judæ mentio ostendit, non habuisse alias Judam aliquid decoris, quo se potuisset efferre.*" תִּפְאֶרֶת, not *gloriatio*, but *decus, majestas*. The discourse is here only of the possession of advantages, which, however, might easily be abused, by the corruption of human nature, to self-exaltation above others, and above God, and the too great accumulation of which must therefore be guarded against. It appears that the prophet here had in view such an abuse, as Jerusalem at an earlier period had made of its advantages over the country. The strong shall be delivered by the weak, in order that the true equilibrium may be restored between both, in order, as Jerome remarks, that it may be manifest: "*Domini esse in utrisque victoriam.*"

V. 8. "*In that day the Lord will defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he that stumbleth among them in that day, shall be as David, and the house of David like God, as the angel of the Lord before them.*" The article in הַנִּכְשָׁל must not be overlooked, as it has been by Rückert. It divides the inhabitants of Jerusalem into two parts, the weak and the strong. The latter are afterwards designated by the house of David. The former shall attain to the degree which the strongest among the latter, their ancestor the brave hero and king, David, once occupied; the latter shall rise to an elevation unknown to the former Theocracy. The prophet thus by way of individualization expresses the thought, that at that time the Lord will exalt his people to a glory not imagined in the former Theocracy. Similar, Is. 60 : 22, "The few will become thousands, and the feeble a strong people." נָכְשָׁל, properly a *stumbler*, then in general one who is weak, 1 Sam. 2 : 4. Calvin: "*Quasi diceret: Erunt omnes instructi heroica et regia virtute non modo homines plebeji, sed etiam, qui videntur similes esse fœminis, et qui nihil virile præ se ferunt, illi tamen excellent heroica virtute Davidis.*" — כַּאלֹהִים is by most interpreters (Calvin, Michaelis, Mark, Burk, Rosenmüller) translated, *as an angel*. But this import the word never has, as we have already shown, Vol. I. p. 92. But the reason given for this interpretation well deserves to be considered, viz. that

otherwise the progress to the following, "as the angel of the Lord," will not, as we should naturally expect, be a climax. The difficulty however may be removed by the following remark. אֱלֹהִים expresses, (as even the plural form, the usual designation of the *abstract*, (comp. Ewald, p. 326,) shows,) the abstract conception of Deity. When it is not rendered concrete by the article, it often stands where merely what is superhuman, or more than earthly, is designated, (comp. Ewald, *Die Composition der Genesis*, p. 26 ff.) Especially remarkable in this respect is Ps. 8: 5, "Thou hast made man a little lower than מֵאֱלֹהִים, God" (מִן according to usage, can indicate only the thing in which the deficiency is). Here those who understand by אֱלֹהִים "the one true God," are in as great an error as those, who, merely from the difficulty of escaping from this unpleasant sense, give, as here, the sense *angel* to אֱלֹהִים, which, however, does not suit, for the simple reason, that the angels have no dominion over nature, while nevertheless the subject of discourse is solely that dignity, which man possesses as a vicegerent of God. Hence those expose themselves to ridicule, who would deduce from this Psalm a proof of the moral dignity of man since the fall. We find the true interpretation in Calvin: "*Verba Davidis perinde valere interpretor, ac si dixisset, parum abesse homines a divino et cœlesti statu.*" "Thou hast exalted him almost to a divinity." This, when applied to the passage before us, where אֱלֹהִים stands in like manner without the article, shows at once that there is actually a progress from the lesser to the greater. "The house of David will be as something more than earthly," is not so strong as, "it will be as the angel of the Lord." We must not with some translate, "as *an* angel," or "*an* angel of the Lord," (Rückert, comp. Vol. I. p. 174,) but "*the* angel of the Lord," his revealer, to whom Zechariah constantly attributes his names and works, (comp. p. 83.) In these last words לִפְנֵיהֶם is understood in different ways. After the Syriac, several (Michaelis, Burk, Rosenmüller): "Who was before them." Eichhorn: "As (once) Jehovah's angel in the front of Israel." But we see not the use of this forced interpretation, since in the other, "The house of David will be as the angel of the Lord before them," there is no difficulty. According to this also, there is an allusion to the march through the wilderness, where the angel of the Lord went before Israel, (comp. Vol. I. p. 167.) Parallel as to the expression is Mic. 2: 13, "Their king marches before them, וַיַּעֲבֹר מַלְכָּם לִפְנֵיהֶם, and the Lord in their front." The בְּ does not here denote

equality, but resemblance, just as 2 Sam. 14:17. "For as the angel of the Lord, so is my Lord the King, to hear the good and the evil." V. 20, "My Lord is wise, as the wisdom of the angel of the Lord, to know all that is on earth." Equality, there, is surely not intended. — Erroneously Calvin: "*Jubet fideles attendere ad domum Davidis, quæ nunc prorsus spoliata erat omni dignitate, ut nulla esset juvandi facultas. Nihil enim tunc potuit cerni in posteris Davidis nisi probrosum, vel saltem contemptibile. Et tamen propheta jubet ipsos sperare salutem ex illa domo.*" The house of David forms here, as the antithesis in the verse, and also the comparison of v. 12, show, only a type for the noblest of the covenant people, and their future leaders; just as the prophet designates the future enemies of the covenant people by Egypt and Ashur; their future deliverance, as a passage through the Red Sea; the land of their future exile, by Shinar.

V. 9. "*It will be in that day, that I will seek to destroy all nations, who come against Jerusalem.*" — Several interpreters translate אֲבַקֵּשׁ לְהַשְׁמִיד, *I will seek out*, in order to destroy. But the strikingly coincident parallel passage, chap. 6:7, "The strong *strove* to go through the whole earth, and the Lord said; Do it," shows, that here also the verb בָּקַשׁ with לְ must be understood of a striving after something. Calvin: "*Intelligit deum* intentum *fore, quemadmodum solent homines solliciti et qui serio aliquid procurant: — summo studio ero attentus.*"

V. 10. "*And I pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of gracious supplication, and they look on me whom they have pierced, and they lament for him as the lamentations for an only son, and mourn for him as the mourning for the first-born.*" — On וְשָׁפַכְתִּי Jerome remarks justly: "*Verbum effusionis sensum largitatis ostendit.*" It is at first view remarkable, that here, as chap. 13:1, only the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem are mentioned, and not Judah. This is explained by the frequent practice of the more ancient prophets of designating the Theocracy by its capital or central point, Jerusalem or Zion. The prophet could the more readily adopt this usage here, since the former contrast between Jerusalem and Judah no longer existed; and in reference to the outpouring of the Spirit there was not, as in respect to the deliverance, a difference which could induce him, as there, to make a separation. In the first part also, Jerusalem only is mentioned several times, though the prophet

had in view the whole Theocracy. Thus e. g. chap. 3 : 2, "The Lord rebuke thee, who chooses *Jerusalem;*" chap. 8 : 8, while in other passages, e. g. 1 : 12, the Theocracy is designated by Jerusalem and the cities of Judah. — The spirit of grace is the spirit which works grace; brings grace with it; comp. the entirely similar idiom, Is. 11 : 1, "The spirit of wisdom, of power," &c. By חֵן grace is not to be understood as an attribute of God, but its operation as a new principle of life in man. Very significant is the combination of grace and gracious supplication. By the very choice of the expressions derived from the same root, it is intimated that this supplication has its source in grace. Burk: "*Sic vero Judæi toti sanabuntur ab opinione meriti et a consuetudine* precularum." The verb הִבִּיט with אֶל often stands, where a spiritual or a corporeal looking upon an object, with confidence in it, is intended, in like manner as θεωρεῖν, e. g. John 6 : 40. Thus is it, Num. 21 : 9, in reference to the brazen serpent, by looking upon which the Israelites were healed. It stands here in silent antithesis with the contempt and disgust with which Israel had formerly turned away his face from the Messiah, comp. Is. 53 : 14. — Very remarkable is, "on me." The speaker, according to v. 1, is the Lord, the creator of heaven and earth. That we are not, however, to understand by him, the one invisible God exalted above all suffering, is shown by what follows, where this Jehovah represents himself as pierced by Israel, and now bewailed by him in bitter repentance. We are rather led thereby to the angel and revealer of the most High God, to whom the prophet, on account of his participation in the divine nature, attributes all, even the most exalted names of God, (comp. p. 24, who had also, according to chap. 11, undertaken the office of shepherd over the people, and been rewarded by them with the basest ingratitude. The *suff.* in עָלָיו is taken by several interpreters, who adhere to the Messianic interpretation, not for a person, but for a thing. So Gousset, Schultens, *Animadvv. Phill.* on the passage, and Dathe, "They lament for it," viz. for the crime of piercing. But the grounds for this interpretation are not tenable. They appeal first to the interchange of persons אֵלַי and עָלָיו. But such a transition from the first to the third person is so frequent, particularly with the prophets, that the citation of particular examples is unnecessary, (comp. Gesen. *Lehrg.* p. 742.) Here, however, a special reason existed in what precedes: "The same whom they have pierced;" wherein there is properly already a transition to the third

person. They remark further: "*Quid fidelcs illi Judæi lugerent* עָלָיו, *de eo, Messia scil. interfecto, quem tamen vivum cum spe et fiducia dicuntur intueri?*" The answer to this question, however, was in part given by Augustine, even before it was asked, *De Civit. Dei, l. XX. Cap.* 30: "*Sicut diximus Judæis, vos occidistis Christum, quamvis hoc parentes eorum fecerint, sic et ipsi dolebunt se fecisse quodammodo, quod fecerunt illi, ex quorum stirpe descendunt. Quamvis igitur, jam accepto spiritu gratiæ et misericordiæ, jam fideles non damnabuntur cum impiis parentibus suis, dolebunt tamen tanquam ipsi fecerint, quod illis factum est. Non igitur dolebunt reatu criminis, sed pietatis effectu.*" They lament for the murdered one, not as though he were still subject to death, but in painful consciousness, that he had been slain by their sins. That the Lord had turned to good what they intended for evil, cannot mitigate their distress. They behold in this only their own deed and its natural result. That their forefathers, and not they themselves, performed the deed, affords them no consolation. They are conscious that the guilt is national; that by participating in the disposition of their fathers, which caused the crime, and by their bitter hatred against the Messiah, they have made themselves partakers in the guilt of this crime, and that it can be punished in them also, with the same right as, at the time of the invasion of the Chaldeans, the sins of former generations were punished in their forefathers, with whom they stood in the closest connexion through their crimes. That which is decisive against this interpretation is, partly, that עַל following the verb סָפַד signifies in general the object, and uniformly the person bewailed, comp. e. g. Jer. 34: 5, 2 Sam. 11: 26, 1 Kings 10: 30; partly, that, in the following context throughout, lamentation for persons only is spoken of, for an only son, for the first-born, for King Josiah; and partly, that, v. 12 – 14, the grievous lamentation of the whole people and of all individuals for one who is dead is plainly represented. — חָמַר, properly, "in making bitter" refers, as the use of the *infin.* itself shows, to the foregoing, "they lament," and we need not therefore, with most interpreters, from a comparison of Is. 22: 4, אַמֲרֵר בַּבְּכִי, here supply *weeping*, and the less so, since the suitableness of the reference to סָפַד is established by Jer. 6: 26, מִסְפַּד תְּמָרוּרִים. The lamentation for an only son occurs also elsewhere as a designation of the deepest mourning; Amos 8: 6, "And I make it as the mourning of the first-born." Jer. 6: 26, "Daughter of my people put on sackcloth, cover thyself with ashes, make for thyself a

lamentation of the first-born." The mourning for the first-born was typified in Egypt, comp. Exod. 11 : 6, "And there was a great cry in the land, such as never had been and never will be." — The fulfilment of the prophecy of our verse was remarkably typified immediately after the crucifixion of Christ, and has been erroneously supposed by several interpreters to have then taken place; comp. Luke 23 : 48, *Καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωροῦντες τὰ γενόμενα τύπτοντες ἑαυτῶν τὰ στήθη* (this the ground meaning of the verb סָפַד, that originally designates an especial manifestation of mourning, comp. Is. 32 : 12, "They beat upon their breasts," Winer s. v.) *ὑπέστρεφον*. The multitude who shortly before had cried out, "Crucify him," here, struck by the manifestation of the superhuman dignity of Jesus, smite upon themselves, and lament for the dead, and their own crime; and the probably transient emotion of those individuals served as a feeble type of the thorough repentance of the whole people. — We have still to notice the reference to this passage in the New Testament. The only proper citation is that of John 19 : 37, *Καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει· Ὄψονται, εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*. In regard to the relation of this citation to the prophecy, we offer the following remarks. 1. The only deviation from the words of the original is the change of the first person into the third. In Zechariah the Messiah himself speaks, John speaks of him, comp. Surenhus. *βιβλ. κατ.* p. 382. That the apostle, who here, leaving the Septuagint, translates immediately from the Hebrew, had before him another reading, is the more improbable, since in the citation, Matt. 27 : 9, from Zech. 11 : 13, we find exactly the same phenomenon, arising from the effort after greater clearness. 2. Although Vitringa (*Obss. II.* 9, p. 172), and Michaelis have taken pains to evince the opposite, yet is it plain that the citation of John refers directly only to the piercing with the lance, and not to the whole crucifixion of Christ. He relates v. 31 – 33, how the bones of the Lord were not broken, as in the case of the others; v. 34, how his side was pierced. He then, v. 26, adduces an Old Testament witness for the first, v. 27, for the second. But, allowing that John cites the prophecy only in reference to this particular circumstance, it by no means follows that he extended it no farther, but only that he found it fulfilled in it, and indeed most justly, since the piercing with the spear, as well as the whole crucifixion, according to Acts 2 : 23, was a work of the Jews in respect to the spiritual, though not the material cause. That John is very

far from always limiting the prophecies to the object to which he immediately refers them, is very evident from chap. 18 : 9; comp. Vol. I. p. 250. But the prophecy would plainly lose in importance if the verb דָּקַר should be limited to the single fact of the piercing with the lance, as has been already shown among others by Lampe, *in Jo. III.* p. 634. Bas. It rather designates the whole suffering by which the death of the Messiah was effected. That this was the substance, and that the instrument and kind of death were unimportant, appears from the comparison of chap. 13 : 7, where the sword is mentioned as the instrument, while דָּקַר rather suggests the idea of a spear. — Besides this direct citation, there is also in two passages, and plainly by design, an allusion to this place, Matt. 24 : 30; *Καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.* Apoc. 1 : 7; *Ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς, καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν.* These passages are a kind of sacred parody of that in Zechariah. They show, that, with the wholesome repentance, the godly sorrow, of which Zechariah speaks, there is another repentance, the despair of Judas; with the voluntary looking to him who had been pierced, another involuntary, from which even the unbeliever cannot escape. The thrilling sublimity of this allusion every one must perceive. It shows, moreover, that the Lord himself and his apostles referred the passage to him. — Before we proceed to the history of the interpretation, we give the following beautiful remarks respecting it by Franc. Lambert, a Catholic theologian in the first half of the sixteenth century, (*ad. h. l.* p. 186.) "*Sentiat quisque de hoc planctu, quod bonum illi videbitur, ego dico rem magni periculi esse, negare, quod de Israele capiatur. Et quod ad me spectat, sentio firmissime, quod ex omnibus tribubus Israel, reliquiæ tandem ad Dominum Jesum Christum convertentur, et agnoscent eum. Videntes autem suam impietatem et cœcitatem, in qua tot seculis fuerunt, videntes etiam bonitatem dei, qui tam magna illis facere dignatus est, dum carnem ex eis assumpsit, et quod se abnegantes non exterminarit, sed tandem in misericordiam susceperit, congregaritque eos in ecclesiam suam: tum confundentur super iniquitatibus suis, et præ dolore malorum, quæ perpetrarunt, non cum desperatione, sed cum multa fiducia bonitatis dei et Christi plangent. Et tum implebitur hic sermo. Utcunque fuit planctus in Jerusalem Christo passo, sed eidem non convenit fletus ille per familias Israel hic positus.*"

History of the Interpretation.

1. *Among the Jews.*

A valuable collection of materials is given by Frischmuth, *Dissert. de Messia Confixo*, reprinted in the *Thes. Theol. Phil.* I. p. 1042 sq. and Salemann, *Jehovah Transfossus*, ibid. p. 1054 sq. Even before the appearance of Christ, the Jews had occasion to mistake the true sense of the prophecy : it pointed, not merely to a suffering and dying Messiah in general, as Is. 53, but to such a Messiah, who was moreover united with God by a mysterious unity of being, a mystery which could not be perfectly comprehended until after the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh. After the coming of Christ the difficulty must have been increased ; they were not only, as in former times, deprived of the light of the fulfilment, but also driven to extremities by the Christian controversy, which rested on this passage. How little an unprejudiced interpretation can be expected from them under these circumstances, is shown by the *naïve* confession of Abarbanel, that the chief object of his explanation was to remove the stumblingblock, which the Christian interpretation had thrown in the way of his people. The history of this interpretation among the Jews therefore is little more than a statement of the principal ways, which they have pursued in perverting the prophecy. Their contradictory explanations at once awaken suspicion of their correctness.

1. Some sought to remove the difficulty by a figurative understanding of דָּקַר, *to pierce*, i. q. *to grieve*. According to them the verse represents the repentance, which the Jews should experience at a future period, on account of their sin against the Lord. Following this view the Seventy translate Ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ, ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο. After Jerome, many here suppose the Seventy have interchanged וְדָקְרוּ with וְרָקְדוּ, and, indeed, there are not wanting examples of a similar metathesis, comp. Hottinger, *Thes. Philol.* p. 361. Others suppose, after Lud. Cappellus and Frischmuth, that they read וְדָקְדוּ in their manuscripts, which is by no means probable ; for this reading has otherwise nothing in its favor. Others, with Cocceius and Buxtorf, suppose them, in their embarrassment, to have substituted by conjecture וְדָקְרוּ for וְרָקְדוּ. That Vossius (*De Translat. LXX. Interprett.* p. 20 and 77), from blind partiality for the Seventy, asserted that ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο was a later

corruption, we would not mention, if Ewald (*Commentar. in Apoc.*, p. 93,) had not recently expressed the same opinion. This cannot well be explained, except from the effort to set aside an argument, not entirely unimportant, for the genuineness of the Apocalypse, the remarkable coincidence in the citation of this passage, John 19 : 37, and Apoc. 1 : 7, which can by no means be set aside by appealing to the analogy of the coincidence of Aq., Symm., and Theodotion in the use of *ἐκκεντεῖν*, since one of these used the others, and since their agreement is confined exclusively to *ἐκκεντεῖν*. How could this later corruption of the Septuagint arise? It must be supposed to have proceeded from Christians. For the Evangelist John and the author of the Apocalypse must both have drawn from the Seventy. But at a later period it would have been impossible for the Jews to have corrupted the text, since this passage attracted from the beginning the highest attention of Christians. Moreover, the Alexandrian version is known to have been soon given up by the Jews. That the change was made by Christians is however just as impossible. How could they have acted so directly in opposition to their own interests, how could they have brought the passage in the Seventy in contradiction with the citation in John? A mistake of a single transcriber would immediately have been perceived, and could not have been handed down in all the manuscripts. The reading cannot have arisen from an interpolation of the other Greek translations, since no one of these has the present reading of the Seventy. — The correct view, viz. that the Seventy read indeed דָּקְרוּ, but, because they regarded the proper meaning of the verb as absurd, gave it a figurative import, *to pierce = to insult*, has been taken by only a few, among the ancients, Lampe, l. c., p. 633, among the moderns, Schleusner s. v. *κατορχ.*, comp. also *Vogel zu Cappell.* I. 140. The correctness of this view is rendered certain, if we only consider the example of a similar proceeding of the Seventy in the portion before us. Particularly remarkable is their translation of the same verb דָּקַר in chap. 13 : 3. The meaning *to pierce*, appeared to them there unsuitable, because they could not think that parents could be so cruel as to slay their son, perhaps also, because they supposed, like several later interpreters, that the discourse, v. 5, 6, relates to the same individual. It could not therefore be supposed that he was slain. They translate, therefore, דָּקַר in this place by *συμποδίζειν*, "to bind together the feet," while they always render it elsewhere by *ἀποκεντεῖν, ἐκκεντεῖν, κατακεντεῖν, τιτρώσκειν.*

Another example is found in chap. 12: 8. It there appeared to them strange, that the house of David should be as God. They therefore translated בֵּאלֹהִים by ὡς οἶκος θεοῦ, while Jonathan ("*sicut principes prosperabuntur*") sought to remove the difficulty in another way by giving to אֱלֹהִים the sense *magnates*. — This alone may perhaps be conceded to the defenders of the other views, that the Seventy in choosing precisely the verb *κατορχέομαι* to express the idea of the contempt and crime of which the Jews had been guilty, were induced by the recollection of the verb דָּקַר, related perhaps in their opinion with the verb דָּרַךְ. — We have no hesitation in attributing the same interpretation to the Chaldee also, whose words, in many ways misunderstood, have been rightly interpreted, as far as we know, only by Lampe, l. c. He translates וְיִבְּעִין מִן קֳדָמַי עַל דִּי אִתְטַלְטִלוּ. This is commonly explained, (comp. e. g. Lightfoot on John 19: 37): "*Orabunt coram me, quoniam translati fuerunt.*" According to the opinion of the paraphrast, the Jews, with bitter lamentations on account of their exile, shall turn to the Lord. But this interpretation has no foundation in the text. This difficulty, however, is removed as soon as אטלטל is understood of wandering in a moral sense, a wandering in which a man loses sight of the Lord; comp. טִיוּל, *vagatio, lusus;* טַיָּיל, *ambulator, otiosus spectator.* Buxt., s. v. — We now inquire whether this interpretation, which, given up by the later Jews, who uniformly understand דָּקַר in a literal sense, found some defenders in the Christian church, is admissible. Great doubt must be awakened by the very fact, that the verb דָּקַר never occurs elsewhere in a figurative sense, but always in a literal, in which it is found even in this portion, chap. 13: 3. The figurative meaning however is entirely excluded by what follows. Were the verb דָּקַר to be taken in a metaphorical sense, how then could lamentation over one who was dead, be there the subject of discourse? How could it be compared with lamentation over the death of an only son, with that for King Josiah, who had been slain? It remains, therefore, only to take the word in its usual sense, and to seek for the figure in the whole description. God, as it were, slain by the sins of the Jews; the repentance which they experience for their sins, under the image of a lamentation for one who has been slain. But let any one search the whole Old Testament and see whether he can find elsewhere any thing analogous to this figurative representation, which is so strange and so militates against the honor of God. — It would be altogether unsuitable to appeal to the fact,

that the verb נָקַב, *perforare, to pierce*, is also used of God. For it is by no means used in this original, but in a figurative sense, *to reproach*, (comp. Winer, s. v.) and, even in this sense, not connected immediately with Jehovah, but, for the sake of reverence, only with the name of God; comp. Levit. 24 : 11. Still less to the purpose is קָבַע, *to rob*, which is spoken of God, Mal. 3 : 8. God might be said to be robbed, in respect to His possessions as King of Israel. The killing, on the contrary, refers to the person. To these negative grounds, which refute this interpretation, must be added the positive proofs, which justify the reference to the Messiah, viz. the manifest identity of the subject, who is here slain and lamented, with the good shepherd whose faithful services the people, according to chap. 11, reward with ingratitude, who, according to chap. 13 : 7, is slain, and for whose sake the people are visited with severe judgments, until at last the remnant, purified by affliction, turn to the Lord, and are again graciously received. And finally, it is supported by the authority of the New Testament.

2. Still there is one remarkable proof, that the correct interpretation, that of the one true Messiah, was not unknown among the older Jews. In the Talmud of Jerusalem, fol. 12, 1, ed. Dessov. (comp. Vol. I. p. 211) that, and that only, is mentioned. "There are two opinions, the one, that it is a lamentation on account of the Messiah; the other, that it is a lamentation on account of sinful corruption." This has been frequently understood, as though the one had made sinful corruption the object of the whole prophecy in this verse. It would then be inconceivable how this strange opinion could arise. But it is not so. Both views coincide in their reference to the Messiah. The difference consists, as is evident from a more accurate view of the words, and a comparison of the corresponding passage in the Babylonish Talmud, only in the different understanding of the *suff.* in עָלָיו. The one referred it to the person of him who was pierced, the other understood it of the thing, exactly as Schultens and Dathe; on account of it, viz. their sin, which either directly, or, what is more probable, indirectly, has caused the death of the Messiah. So much is certain. But how these Rabbins explained the particulars in the passage, how they escaped from the difficulty, which they must have found in the expression, "They look upon me whom they have pierced;" whether with Symmachus in the Cod. Barberinus, according to De Rossi, who has himself carefully compared this Cod., they perhaps trans-

lated οὐν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν, "They look upon me, the Lord, *with* him," whom they, either the Jews or the enemies, have pierced; or, with several later Jews, "They look to me, they turn with weeping to me," *because* they, i. e. the enemies, have pierced; we are unable to make out, because the difference, there mentioned, does not concern the sense of the whole passage, but only the object of the lamentation. In any event, however, the passage is very important, because it shows, that the doctrine of a dying Messiah was not strange to the older Jews, and at the same time also, that in some way or other they connected his death with the sin of the people. — In process of time, however, this view was found inconvenient, and recourse was had to the figment of the twofold Messiah, the son of David and the son of Joseph, to the latter of whom were referred the passages which seem to treat of a dying Messiah, (comp. Vol. I. p. 210.) This was done, in reference to the passage before us, even in the Babylonish Talmud, (comp. Vol. I. p. 211), where the question whether the lamentation refers to the Messiah, or to sin, is renewed, and the former view is declared as unquestionably correct, with an appeal to the argument, that the lamentation must necessarily relate to the same subject, who, according to the preceding context, had been pierced. Among the later Rabbins, Abarbanel (on the passage) follows this interpretation, who nevertheless elsewhere (remarkable indecision !) advances the one, here rejected by himself, of Kimchi and Jarchi, which will hereafter be cited. He says: "*Multo rectior interpretatio illa est, qua de Messia filio Josephi vaticinium accipitur, uti patres nostri b. m. interpretati sunt. Is enim ex tribu Josephi oriundus, vir summis viribus et bello eximius erit dux exercitus dei in bello isto, quo vitam cum morte commutabit.*" Similar Abenezra: "*Effundam spiritum gratiæ et precum super habitatores Hierosolymitanos. Ante vero quam hoc fiat, horribili plaga afficientur, dum Messias fil. Josephi occidetur. Et tunc deus iratus omnes gentes perdet, quæ Hierosolymam venerunt. Et hoc est, quod dicitur: et respicient. Tunc respicient omnes gentes ad me, visuræ, quid illis facturus sim, qui Messiam filium Josephi occiderunt.*" Finally, this interpretation is found also in *Jalkut Chasdasch*, fol. 24, in Glaesener *De Gemino Jud. Messia*, p. 57: כי אחרי שידקר יונה שחוא משיח בן יוסף אחרי כן יבא דויד דהינו משיח בן דויד, "After Jonas shall have been pierced, i. e. the Messiah Ben Joseph, then will David come, i. e. the Messiah Ben David." It was now incumbent on the defenders of this interpretation to solve the difficult prob-

lem, how it could be reconciled with, "They look upon *me*, the same whom they have pierced." In this endeavour they took different and equally unsuccessful ways. *a.* They changed without hesitation the unpleasant אֵלַי into אֵלָיו. And thus is the text without farther remark cited in the Talmud, and in *En Israel*, p. 117. Thus, according to a remarkable passage of *Rabanus Maurus contra Judæos, n.* 12, (in Wagenseil, *Sota*, p. 68,) it was found even in his time (§ IX.) in the margin of many manuscripts: "*Ubi nos juxta fidem scripturæ sanctæ in persona dei legimus: Et adspicient ad me quem confixerunt: illi, quamvis in ipso textu libri, divino nutu terrente, non fuerint ausi mutare, tamen extrinsecus e latere annotatum habent: Adspicient ad eum, quem confixerunt. Et sic tradunt suis discipulis, ut, sicut in textu continetur, transscribant, et, sicut foris annotatum est, legant, ut teneant videlicet, quod juxta eorum dementiam Judæi aspiciant ad eum, quem confixerunt Gog et Magog.*" In the thirteenth century this reading had forced its way into the text of many manuscripts. Comp. Raim. Martini, p. 411. Lips.: "*Nota, quod aliqui Judæi, hujusmodi tam evidens sacræ scripturæ testimonium sufferre non valentes, literam in hoc loco falsificant, et dicunt* אֵלָיו, *ut sic non de deo, sed de alio possit intelligi;*" comp. the same, p. 855, where he appeals, in reply, to the ancient manuscripts, the whole body of which have אֵלַי. The reading אֵלָיו also actually occurs in 49 Codd. Kennic., and in 13 De Rossi, besides in the original text of several Rabbinical writings, while in their editions it is in part expunged; comp. De Rossi, l. c. That the reading אֵלַי is correct, surely needs no extensive proof. It is grammatically the more difficult; it is opposed to the favorite opinions of the Jews; it is found in all the translations, whose testimony is here the more complete, since even those of *Aq.*, *Symm.*, *Theod.* are preserved in a *Scholion* of the *Cod. Barber.*; it is found in by far the most numerous and best manuscripts. — More difficult is the question, whether the reading אֵלָיו originated from doctrinal interest, and affords an example of a corruption of the text, attempted by the Jews, as Wagenseil especially, l. c., has endeavoured to show, while Hackspan (*De Usu Librr. Rabbinic.* p. 295), and De Rossi, assert the contrary. We must decide in favor of the former. It is true, indeed, that examples are not wanting, in which the Keri, in passages where the construction is suddenly changed from the first person to the third, endeavours to restore grammatical correctness; but, as yet, they did not venture to receive these proposed emendations into the

text; here where the reading אֵלָיו first meets us in the Talmud, its connexion with the interest of the Jews is too obvious; in like manner, as in the *Jalkut*, where, in order to be able to refer the passage to the Messiah Ben Joseph, אל is read, "to him whom they have pierced," which deviation from the Talmud clearly shows how little they were induced by external reasons to depart from the received interpretation. Had the emendation been occasioned here by the grammatical anomaly, why did it occur to no one instead of עליו to read עלי? When De Rossi urges, against the supposition of an intended corruption, that no Jewish polemic refutes the Christian interpretation by appealing to the reading אליו, this fact might easily be turned against him. It furnishes a clear testimony to their evil conscience; had they attained to the reading אליו in a lawful manner, they would not have failed to appeal to it. They use it, however, cautiously, more for their own quiet than for controversy against their enemies; and, as they saw that the object could not be accomplished, that the corruption could not possibly be introduced into all manuscripts, and that attention was awakened to the subject, they entirely relinquished this reading and resorted to less doubtful methods. *b.* They gave to אֵת אֲשֶׁר another meaning: "They look with weeping to me, *because* they, the heathen, had pierced him, the son of Joseph." This understanding of אֵת אֲשֶׁר requires a closer examination, because it is repeated by recent interpreters. That אֵת אֲשֶׁר cannot mean precisely *because* needs no proof. Still the assumed sense might in two respects be defended with some plausibility. First by the assumption of an *accus. absol.*: "They look to me, in reference to him whom they have pierced." But the alleged *ac. abs.* is in Hebrew a pure invention of the empirical grammarians, as any one may easily convince himself by a view of the examples cited in its favor by Gesenius, *Lehrg.* p. 725, and *Comm. zu Jes.* 53: 8. Does not the *acc.* of the noun in such passages as Is. 8: 13; "The Lord of Hosts, him shall ye sanctify," depend on the same transitive verb as the pronoun? Among the cited passages, however, with the exception of Is. 53: 8, the interpretation of which is plainly erroneous, there is not one, where such a dependence cannot be shown, unlike the passage before us, or where the apparent *accus. absol.* is not one altogether usual, and explained from a confounding of two constructions as Zech. 8: 17: כִּי אֶת־כָּל־אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר שָׂנֵאתִי, a combination of, "all this I hate," and "all this is that which I hate." — Another way of understanding it is, "And they look to him, *that*

they have pierced." It is true, that אֵת אֲשֶׁר sometimes thus occurs e. g. Ezek. 36 : 27 : "I will make, אֶת־אֲשֶׁר בְּחֻקַּי תֵּלֵכוּ, that ye walk in my laws." But in this case, as also in all the passages where this construction occurs, (comp. 1 Sam. 2 : 22–24, 11 : 19, Esth. 5 : 11,) a transitive verb must precede. אֵת is here, as always, a sign of the *accus.*, and the *accus.* is governed by the transitive verb; the whole proposition following אֵת is treated as a noun in the *accus.*, see e. g. the cited passage of Ezekiel, i. q., "I will make your walking in my laws," comp. Ewald, p. 648. Accordingly, therefore, *that* is never the *signification*, but only in certain cases, with which the passage before us has nothing in common, *the sense* of אֵת אֲשֶׁר. — It is scarcely worth the trouble to remark, against the already obsolete explanation of the Messiah Ben Joseph in general, that it is a mere invention of the later Jews, which is shown, even by the remark of Kimchi against the reference of this passage to him, "*Sed hoc interpretamentum miror cur ita occultarint, neque ejus generaliter meminerint*," never to have obtained general approbation, and which the more intelligent, either like Maimonides by their silence, or like Manasseh Ben Israel expressly, reject. It is of more importance to give prominence to a remark, which concerns not this interpretation alone, but the whole of the kind to which it belongs. The looking upon him who was pierced, the loud lamentation over his death, is here represented, as a consequence of the spirit of grace poured out upon Israel, as a sign of his genuine conversion, the fruits of which are described in chap. 13 : 1 – 6. But how can the lamentation over a leader, slain by enemies, be represented as a consequence of conversion?

3. Still wider do those err, who, as Kimchi, Jarchi, and Manasseh Ben Israel, (in Hulsius, *Theol. Jud.* p. 513), by him who was pierced, understand every Israelite, who fell in the war against Gog and Magog: "*Omnes lamentabuntur ob unius interitum, ac si integer exercitus cæsus esset.*" These also follow, partly the false reading אליו, and partly give to אֵת אֲשֶׁר the untenable meaning *because*, as Kimchi explains it by בֵּיעָבוּר. They are also liable to the last objection urged against the foregoing explanation. Nor can they justify the unnatural supposition of a change of the subject in דָּקָרוּ, and the omission of the *suff.* This unfortunate explanation has been occasioned especially by the fear of yielding too much to the Christians, by interpreting the passage of the Messiah Ben Joseph. There was the more reason for this fear, since they felt how danger-

ous it must be to attempt to prove the existence of the fictitious Messiah Ben Joseph, since, if they failed, the reference of the passage to Messiah Ben David, could not be avoided, so long as the Messianic interpretation in general prevailed. How strong this fear was, appears from the circumstance, that, in a Polish edition of Jarchi, the passage where he designates the explanation of the Messiah Ben Joseph, as ancient and confirmed in the Talmud, is omitted ; comp. *Steph. le Moyne ad Jerem.* 23 : 6, p. 134.

2. *By the Christians.*

In the Christian church, as could not but be expected, the reference to Christ has always prevailed. It is therefore superfluous to cite the numerous names of its defenders, among whom even J. D. Michaelis on the passage belongs, although he ungrammatically explains : " They will look upon me, *and* upon him, whom they have pierced." We shall occupy ourselves only with the exceptions from the rule, those who give up the Messianic interpretation ; and we can here be brief, since the refutation is already contained in what precedes.

1. In the footsteps of the Seventy, and the Chaldee, though independent of them, follows in a measure Calvin on the passage, and on John 19 : 37 : " *Metaphorice hic accipitur confixio pro continua irritatione, ac si diceret : Judæos sua pervicacia fuisse quasi accinctos ad bellum, ut deum pungerent ac configerent sua malitia, vel telis rebellionis suæ. — Sensus — hic est : Quum Judæi secure multis modis provocassent deum, aliquando pœnitentiam acturos, quia scil. incipient terreri dei judicio, quum prius nemo eorum cogitaret de reddenda vitæ ratione.*" Still the essential difference between Calvin and the Jewish and Rationalist interpreters, who advance this explanation, is not to be overlooked. According to him, the prophecy is indeed in the first instance to be understood figuratively, and referred to God ; it happened however by a special divine guidance, that it was also literally fulfilled in Christ, united with God by unity of being, that his history constituted a *visible symbol* of its contents. That he here had in view a much closer relation of the prophecy to the fulfilment in Christ, than the so-called mystical sense of Grotius, which properly, as Reuss, *Opusc.* I. p. 74 ff., has already

shown, was a mere shadow without the substance, appears from the whole of the following explanation, in which his figurative understanding of the passage seems entirely to disappear. The explanation of Calvin in former times met with general contradiction; Lampe bitterly complains, that the private view of Calvin was attributed to the reformed church, with a view to cast reproach upon it. Besides an anonymous writer in Martini, *De Tribus Elohim*, c. 112, and the Socinian Smalcius, it found a defender only in Grotius. From him it has been eagerly borrowed by recent interpreters, as Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, Theiner.

2. The interpretation of the Messiah Ben Joseph has been of late so far defended, as that several refer the prophecy to the death of a distinguished Jewish commander. Jahn, *Einl.* II. 2, p. 671, hit upon Judas Maccabeus and translates: "They will look on Jehovah on account of him, whom they have pierced," and thus bears testimony himself against his interpretation. A commander of the Jews, who lost his life in that war (who he was, is uncertain,) is conjectured by Bauer, *Schol. ad h. l.* He translates, following the interpretation of אֵת אֲשֶׁר as *acc. absol.*, which has already been shown to be inadmissible: "*Respicient ad me, deum, opis implorandæ causa, quod attinet ad eum, quem transfixerunt.*" In favor of the same view Bertholdt also seems to decide, *Einl.* IV. p. 1716.

3. The merit of finding out a new interpretation belongs, among the non-Jewish, and at the same time non-Messianic interpreters, only to Vogel. He asserts on *Cappelli Crit. Sacr.* I. p. 140, that the prophet speaks not of the Messiah, but of himself!

V. 11. "*At that time there shall be a great lamentation in Jerusalem, like the lamentation of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo.*" The prophet here exerts himself to the utmost in order to make the lamentation appear as great, and as general, as possible, and therefore to refute every reference of his prophecy to any event, which was only a prelude of its proper object. The lamentation of Hadadrimmon was here not a lamentation, which happened at Hadadrimmon, but which belonged to that place, so far as there was the object of it, as there the pious King Josiah was slain. That the lamentation over him, who was pierced, is compared particularly

with that over the death of this king, appears from the following reasons. 1. The lamentation, which the prophet here takes for the comparison, must have been one of the most distressing that had ever occurred. This was evidently that for Josiah. According to 2 Chron. 35 : 25, Jeremiah composed an elegy on his death; others were composed and sung by male and female singers. These became current in Israel as popular songs, and continued so until the time of the writer of the Chronicles. They were received into a collection of songs of lamentations concerning the mournful fate of the nation, which after the death of Josiah was rapidly hurried to its ruin. Herein we have the proof, as well of the greatness of the lamentation, as also of a continued lively remembrance of it in later times, until after the exile. 2. The subject of the lamentation must have been a *pious* king, and the comparison becomes the more suitable, when he is one, who in a certain respect died for the sins of the people. Both of these were fully realized in Josiah. He was, according to 2 Kings 23 : 25, &c., of all the kings of Judah, the most pious; but still God was not therefore moved to change the decree of destruction. He died, not so much a sacrifice to the improvidence, with which he engaged in a war with the more powerful king of Egypt, as a sacrifice to the sins of his people. Had these not called forth the vengeance of God, he would have preserved him, either from this improvidence itself, or from the consequences of it. 3. The comparison requires the person slain to be a king of Judah, and lamented at Jerusalem. "At Jerusalem" is plainly to be supplied also in the second member: "The lamentation will be great at Jerusalem, as there the lamentation of *Hadadrimmon* was great," the *gen.* precisely as in חֶרְפַּת מִצְרַיִם, "the reproach from Egypt." Both these happened in the case of Josiah. Mortally wounded, the king was brought back to Jerusalem, where, immediately after his arrival, the last spark of life was extinguished, and now began the lamentation for him, the beloved one, with whom the Theocracy seemed to be borne to its grave; comp. 2 Chron. 35 : 22. The apparent contradiction between this passage and that in the books of Kings, which makes Josiah die at Megiddo, is to be explained merely from the effort at brevity in the latter, who, in harmony with his design, is throughout less accurate, than the writer of Chronicles, in reference to external and unimportant circumstances. It was not a matter of moment to him, that the king still retained a feeble spark of life. He caused him to die at Megiddo, because

there he received his mortal wound. 4. The place accurately coincides. Verbally the same as here, it is said in Chronicles, Josiah was *pierced through*, מְגֻנֶּה. The difference is only that here the place is especially designated, in which Josiah received his mortal wound. Grotius: "*Sicut illa Darii ad Arbella, ab Arbellitide regione, et ad Gaugamela ex oppido aut vico propinquo.*" That Hadadrimmon was situated in the valley of Megiddo or Jezreel is expressly testified by Jerome: "*Hadadrimmon urbs est juxta Jezreelem, hoc olim vocabulo nuncupata, et hodie vocatur Maximianopolis in campo Mageddon, in quo Josias rex justus a Pharaone cognomento Necho vulneratus est.*" That it is not elsewhere mentioned in the Old Testament, and was entirely unknown to the Seventy, as their understanding of the word as an appellative shows, can be explained either from the mere insignificance of the place, or with Wichmanshausen, *De Planctu Hadadrimmon* in the *Thes. N. Theol. Phil.* I. p. 1107 ff., from the fact that *Hadadrimmon, decus granatorum*, was less the proper name of the place, than an honorable epithet. — Notwithstanding these plain reasons, there have not been wanting those, who have denied the reference to Josiah, or have connected still another therewith. The latter course is that of the Chaldee interpreter, who paraphrases: "*Sicut planctus Ahab, filii Homri, quem occidit Hadadrimmon, filius Tabrimmon, in Ramath Gilead, et sicut planctus Josiæ, filii Amon, quem occidit Pharao claudus in valle Mageddon.*" He understands Hadadrimmon as a proper name of the Syrian king, who slew Ahab, borrowed, according to the prevailing custom of the Syrians and Babylonians, from the name of an idol, Rimmon. The lamentation of Hadadrimmon, according to him, is that caused by Hadadrimmon. Should this reference in general be established, it must be the exclusive one; for how a second can be reconciled with the words of the text, as soon as Hadadrimmon is understood as the proper name of an individual, is inconceivable. In fact it appears as though the Chaldee paraphrast has combined both references, only because he was uncertain which of the two to choose, and not because he regarded both as equally valid. That the exclusive reference to Ahab, however, is untenable should need no proof. Of all the characteristics above mentioned, one only belongs to him, that of dying in the valley of Megiddo. The discourse cannot be of a general and painful lamentation over this ungodly king of apostate Israel. He was so generally hated, that no man would wash his unclean blood from

his cheeks, and for this, as a disgraceful task, it was necessary to hire vile persons. Omitting other still more absurd opinions, (comp. die Widerleg. ders. bei Wichm. p. 1109 ff.), we mention only that of Hitzig, *Stud. u. Crit.* 1830, I. p. 29. He refers the passage to the death of Ahaziah, 2 Kings 9 : 27, a reference which Melancthon, *Opp.* t. II. p. 539, (" *Similitudo sumta est ab interitu duorum regum, Ochosiæ et Josiæ, qui ambo non procul a Megiddoh interfecti sunt,*") combines with that to Josiah. But we need only compare the marks, which have been exhibited, in order to see, that this reference of Hitzig has been adopted only from prejudice, to favor his false hypothesis concerning the time of the composition of the second part. Ahaziah was any thing but a pious king. " He walked," it is said, 2 Kings 8 : 26, " in the way of the house of Ahab, and did evil in the eye of the Lord, like the house of Ahab, for he was allied in marriage with the house of Ahab." According to a righteous retribution of God, his connexion with the house of Ahab brought him to his death. We will not deny that the usual lamentation was made over him, but surely not such an one, as is here the subject of discourse, not a mere ceremony, as the following context shows, but proceeding from the heart, not performed by hired persons, but by the whole people, and so painful that each one lamented as though he had lost his nearest relation. Such a lamentation is made only for the father of his country, and in Israel such a person was only the true Theocratic prince. The feeling on the death of Ahaziah, smitten of God, who had not time during his short reign to render great service to his people, was certainly not anguish. Lastly, Ahaziah received his mortal wound, not at Hadadrimmon, but in another place, expressly mentioned, chap. 9 : 27. We relinquish, therefore, gladly to the author of this hypothesis the joy of having " neutralized " by it the reference to Josiah. — We only remark how decisively the verse refutes the reference of the foregoing to Jehovah, and establishes that to the Messiah. How absurd were the comparison of the lamentation over the Most High God offended, with that over the King Josiah slain ! How well suited, on the contrary, is the latter to be a type of the Messiah ! He was slain on account of the sin of his people ; his reign was the last gracious look of the Lord ; henceforth inexpressible misery followed ; the lamentation for his death arose from the mingled feeling of love, and of anguish for their own sins, which had caused him to be sacrificed.

V. 12–14. The reason, why the prophet so fully describes the lamentation for him who was pierced, is given by Calvin as follows: "*Videtur frustra plus verborum consumere Zach., quam opus sit, quia plus satis prolixus est in re clara. Sed attendere oportet ad pondus ipsum: fuit enim incredible, posse ex gente illa aliquos resipiscere, quum omnes fere dati essent in reprobum sensum. Quis enim unquam putasset adhuc esse locum gratiæ dei, ubi, quantum in se erat, omnes a minimo usque ad maximum conati fuissent Christum demergere in tenebras?*" But, together with this general design, a special and twofold object appears in this description. 1. To represent the lamentation of Israel as real, and not ceremonial; his conversion as inward and genuine. The prophet accomplishes this object by continuing the figurative representation he had begun, and causing every family, and again in every family, the men and women, to mourn apart. It is thus intimated that every family, and every division of the same, would mourn, as if they had to lament the death of one of their own members. Next, his object was to represent the lamentation as strongly as possible, as extending through the whole people; the conversion, not perhaps as relating to a few, as at the coming of Christ in humiliation, and shortly after that of the most miserable sheep, who esteem the good shepherd, chap. 11:11, but as a national affair. To accomplish this object, the prophet mentions first, two chief tribes, and connects with them, in order to show that the conversion would extend from beginning to end, two of their chief families, and then joins with them, in order to express the idea of the whole of the people, all the remaining families. And thus, like Paul, Rom. 11:26, he makes all Israel to be saved. V. 12. "*And the land mourns every family apart, the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart, the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart.*" V. 13. "*The family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart, the family of the house of Shimei apart, and their wives apart.*" V. 14. "*All the remaining families, every family apart, and their wives apart.*" — In respect to the nearest determination of the families, which the prophet here particularly mentions, as participating in the lamentation for the Messiah, the interpreters widely differ. At first view the hypothesis of Jerome is very plausible: "*In Dovid regia tribus accipitur, h. e. Judah. In Nathan prophetalis ordo describitur. Levi refertur ad sacerdotes ex quo ortum est sacerdotium. In Simei doctores accipiuntur; ex hac enim tribu magistro-*

rum agmina pullularunt. Reliquas tribus tacuit, quæ non habent aliquod privilegium dignitatis. But a closer examination shows this view to be wholly untenable. The chief objection is, that, by the family of Shimei, the tribe of Simeon cannot possibly be understood. For, 1. The patronymic of Simeon is not שִׁמְעִי, but Shimeoni, Josh. 21 : 4, 1 Chron. 27 : 16. And, 2. The tribe of Simeon is inappropriate here, where those are mentioned, who enjoy a preëminence. This was so far from being the case, that he did not even, like all the other tribes, that of Levi excepted, who enjoyed instead a rich prerogative, possess a district of his own. That from him proceeded the body of magistrates is a Jewish fiction, whose origin can easily be pointed out. The Jerusalem Targum paraphrases, Gen. 49 : 7; "*Dividam tribum Shimeonis, ut sint positi doctores legis in ecclesia Jacobi et dispergam tribum Levi;*" comp. other Jewish passages in Heidegger, *Hist. Patriarch.* II. p. 484. In this passage of the blessing of Jacob, we have the origin of the fable. The Rabbins, not considering that it is already a blessing for a tribe to belong to the people of God, and not to be expelled from among them, inferred from: "Jacob blessed them," Gen. 49 : 28, that in the discourse of Jacob a special blessing must be contained for each individual tribe. The declaration to Simeon appeared now, not to contain any such; but they suffered themselves to be thereby the less perplexed, since the apparent curse upon Levi, contained in the same verse, was turned into a blessing. With respect to the especial determination of the blessing for Simeon, they supposed it must surely be analogous to that of Levi, because a dispersion in Jacob was in like manner announced to both. They caused, therefore, the tribe of Simeon to share in the office of teachers, with the tribe of Levi, those of a later period at least with a certain kind of subordination, as e. g. Jarchi makes only the secretaries and schoolmasters proceed from the tribe of Simeon. We need scarcely mention, that such an order of teachers from the tribe of Simeon is wholly unknown to history. — The key to a right view is furnished by correctly determining the family of Shimei. This can be done with certainty from Num. 3 : 18, sq. Levi had three sons, Gershom, Kahath, Merari. Gershom two sons, Libni and Schimei. The family of the latter is named, verse 21, exactly as here, מִשְׁפַּחַת הַשִּׁמְעִי, *the family of the Shimeite.* Accordingly an individual, and indeed a subordinate family of the same, is here associated with the whole tribe of Levi. No doubt now remains, that the family of the house of

Nathan, also, cannot be the posterity of the prophet in the time of David, nor still less the prophetic order, which, as not being descended from Nathan, cannot possibly be designated as his family. The family of Nathan must rather be a branch of the family of David, in like manner as that of Shimei is a branch of that of Levi. It is therefore evident, that the prophet intended the family of Nathan, a son of David, who is mentioned 2 Sam. 5 : 14, Luke 3 : 31; that among the sons of David he mentions precisely him, happened, because Nathan, like Shimei, was only a founder of a subordinate family. We have, therefore, the two chief families in the earlier Theocracy, the kingly and the priestly, and, joined with them, two of their subdivisions, in order to show that the conversion of every family would extend to all its members.

Chap. 13.

V. 1. "*At that time a fountain shall be opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness.*" The penitential sorrow of Israel will not be in vain, as indeed it cannot be, since it has been awakened in him by the Lord. Calvin: "*Summa est, deum fore exorabilem Judæis, ubi ita affecti fuerint sincero dolore, et paratam illis fore reconciliationem, quia dominus ab omni inquinamento eos purgabit. — Quamvis modis omnibus sese inquinaverint Judæi, ita ut merito fœteant coram dei oculis, et detestabilis sit eorum immundities, tamen fontem illis fore paratum, quo se purgent, ut scil. prodeant in conspectum dei puri et mundi.*" The fountain is the divine grace, which imparts to the penitent people the forgiveness of sin; the water here is not, as elsewhere, represented as assuaging thirst, but as purifying. The *open* fountain, according to most interpreters, is here contrasted with one shut up, whose water is accessible only to the possessor, the גַּל נָעוּל and מַעְיָן חָתוּם, wherewith, Cant. 4 : 12, the lover compares the beloved, whose loveliness is for him alone. But more correctly Schultens, *Animadvv. Philol.* p. 549, *scaturiet fons.* The fountain is shut up so long as it is concealed in the stones; it is opened when it breaks forth. Parallel is Is. 41 : 18: "I will open, אֶפְתַּח, on the high places streams." 35 : 6, נִבְקְעוּ מַיִם וּנְחָלִים. — On נִדָּה, comp. Ezek. 36 : 17, Is. 64 : 5.

V. 2. The consequence of the forgiveness of sins is a new life of righteousness and holiness, a renunciation, effected by the aid of the Lord, of all that opposes his revealed will. "*And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of Hosts, that I abolish the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall not be mentioned any more; and also the prophets, and the unclean spirit, will I remove from the land.*" Calvin: "*Sicut solis exortu fugantur tenebræ et apparet distincta rerum omnium facies, sic etiam, ubi deus emergit per sui verbi doctrinam, necesse est procul facessere omnes Satanæ imposturas.*" The removal of every thing ungodly from Israel, now again become the covenant people, the prophet here expresses by the abolition of the two manifestations of ungodliness, idolatry and false prophecy, which in the former Theocracy had most prevailed, and we need not hence infer their prevalence in the time of the prophet, or in the future which he describes. These particular manifestations are only accidental, the substance is ungodliness, which is always the same, whether it reveals itself as idolatry and false prophecy, as in this instance, or as Pharisaical self-righteousness. This supposition can here cause the less difficulty, since we have so many striking examples of a designation of the future by the past or present, agreeing with it in substance, though differing in form. The extirpation of the names, "And they shall no more be mentioned," is a frequent designation of the most complete extinction; comp. e. g. Hos. 2 : 19, 14 : 9, Mich. 5 : 11, 13. In respect to the latter, aptly Calvin: "*Intelligit tantam fore detestationem superstitionum, ut populus etiam ad nomen ipsum horreat.*" — "*The prophets.*" That we are not, with Eichhorn and Rückert, to regard the prophet here as predicting the abolition of the prerogatives of prophecy, but rather only the extirpation of the false prophets, appears from the collocation of the prophets with the idols on the one hand, and with the unclean spirit on the other; from the phrase, "I will cause to pass out of the land," which points to a violent expulsion of something bad in itself and polluting to the land; and from the further description, which follows, where two kinds of false prophets are spoken of, those who speak falsehood in the name of the Lord, and those who combine false prophecy with idolatry. The false prophets are called also in other passages simply prophets, (comp. on chap. 10 : 2,) because the use of this name, which they had usurped, in contrast with their real character, served to make their guilt appear in a stronger light, just as the prophet in the foregoing chapter calls the

wolves in the shepherd's clothes, shepherds. The article can prove nothing in favor of the prophets in general being intended, since it rather points to a species of prophets defined by the whole context. — The *unclean spirit*, on the one hand, stands in antithesis with the Holy Spirit, who, according to chap. 12 : 10, was to be poured out, and the fountain for the removal of uncleanness, v. 1, on the other. The special reference to idolatry and false prophecy, chiefly to the latter, appears from the collocation with them ; that the prophet had in view a person, or even merely a personification, does not appear from the article. For this can be explained, either, by an allusion to the former Theocracy, the unclean spirit, who is known to you by his former dominion and ruinous effects ; or, from the antithesis with the Holy Spirit, or from the reference to the false prophets, the unclean spirit by whom they are moved. So much, however, certainly appears from this designation, that the false prophets, as well as the true, perhaps also the worshippers of idols as well as the worshippers of the true God, were under the dominion of a principle foreign to themselves, to which they had surrendered themselves by their own free act. For רוּחַ never stands merely for a man's own disposition. The same also is evident from the relation, 1 Kings 22, where the spirit of prophecy, which, in accordance with the character of the vision appears personified, offers to deceive Ahab by putting false predictions into the mouth of the prophets of the calves. It is here evident, that the false prophets, as well as the true, were under an influence foreign from their nature, a doctrine which is confirmed also by the fundamental view of the New Testament concerning the kingdom of darkness and of light, both in like manner having possession of the minds of those subject to them, (comp. e. g. the parable of the tares and the wheat.) — In numerous passages of the Sohar, the fulfilment of this promise is placed in the Messianic time. We here bring forward only a few. " Sin will not cease from the world until the King Messiah will come at a future time, as the Scripture says : I will cause the unclean spirit," &c. — " The left side will have the upper hand and the unclean be strong, until the Holy God shall build the temple, and firmly establish the world ; then will his word gain its deserved honor, and the unclean side will go out of the world. And that is what the Scripture says : I will cause the unclean spirit," &c. Comp. these and other passages in Schöttgen, *Jesus der wahre Messias*, p. 407 sq.

V. 3. " *And it happens, if a man still prophecy, his father and*

his mother, who begat him, speak thus to him: Thou shalt not live, for thou hast spoken lies in the name of the Lord; and his father and his mother, who begat him, pierce him through in his prophecying." Jerome: "*Statim pater ejus et mater obliviscentur parentum, ut dei retineant servitutem, et proferent contra filium mortis sententiam, et tam piæ erunt omnium in deum mentes, ut non exspectetur publicum judicium, sed pereant, qui tales sunt, sententia propinquorum.*" The fundamental thought is: At that time the command to love God above all, to renounce all that a man has for his sake, will be obeyed. In the expression of this thought the prophet has in view the passages, Deut. 13: 6 – 10 and 18: 20, where the nearest relation of the false prophet was commanded, regardless of all natural feelings, to put him to death, as a violation of the majesty of God. The fact of false prophecy, as Ch. B. Michaelis has justly remarked, is here stated only hypothetically; the prophet employs it only as a foundation for his description of the entire devotedness of the covenant people to God. The phrase *his begetters* is peculiarly emphatic, and is therefore repeated in the relation of the command. It intimates, how hard it must be for parents to deny their natural feeling of parental love, and how great therefore must be their love for God. Hitzig (l. c. p. 28) asserts, that the verb יָלַד stands here, according to the older idiom of Genesis, in the sense *to beget*, and grounds upon it his chief philological argument for the composition of the second part long before Zechariah. But what can be expected of a critic who avails himself of such proof. As the Hebrew has no word for *parents*, the prophet was obliged to employ a designation, which strictly taken was suited only to one party. — The verb דָּקַר, according to several interpreters, does not imply a mortal piercing, but only corporeal punishment. The contrary, however, appears partly from what precedes, "Thou shalt not live," since here the execution of the sentence only is related; partly from the passages of the law, which the prophet had in view. In these the subject of discourse is not punishment in general, but putting to death. Comp. Deut. 18: 20: "The prophet, who presumes to speak any thing in my name, which I have not commanded him, and he who speaks in the name of strange gods, shall die"; Michaelis, Mos. R. V. § 252. The heaviest punishment best serves also to express the thought which the prophet intends. What has led to this supposition is an erroneous idea, that the false prophet in this verse must belong to those who

come forward as actors in what follows. — Moses, in his laws relating to false prophets, had mentioned two classes, those who predicted falsely in the name, under the authority of the true God, giving themselves out as his servants and ambassadors; and those who prophesied in the name of strange gods, derived inspiration from them. Here the prophet brings before us one of the former; v. 5, 6, one of the latter. — "In the very act of prophesying." The parents, as soon as they see the sin, without taking long counsel with flesh and blood, inflict the punishment.

V. 4. "*And in that day the prophets shall desist, ashamed, from their vision in their prophesying, and they shall no longer put on the hairy mantle to lie.*" On the prophets themselves, the deceivers who are least susceptible of good impressions, the great revolution of affairs shall have such an influence, that they will give up their profession from shame. "In their prophesying" again, i. q. "in the very act of prophesying." It is not to be joined with מֵחֲזֹנוֹ, but with יֵבֹשׁוּ. In the very commission of sin, when it is the sweetest and most captivates the mind, they determine to renounce it. With respect to the irregular infinitive form, to be explained from a confounding of the verbs לא and לה, comp. Ewald, p. 454. בּוֹשׁ with מִן, "to desist from any thing ashamed." אַדֶּרֶת שֵׂעָר, *hairy mantle*, was the garment of the true prophets, which was imitated by the false, in order to impose on the people, with whom the garment makes the man; comp. Is. 20:2, 2 Kings 1:8. According to the prevailing view, defended at length particularly by Vitringa, on Is. l. c., the prophets wore this garment as ascetics. But, as the hairy garment is elsewhere always peculiar to mourners, and as the prophets themselves not unfrequently exhort to put it on, as a sign of anguish for sin and the divine judgments, either still impending or already inflicted, it is certainly more obvious to assume, that, with them also, this dress had the same meaning; that it was a *sermo propheticus realis*, a symbol of the lamentation of the prophet over the sins of the people, and over the divine judgments, which they called forth; and the more so, since elsewhere we do not find in the prophecies of the Old Testament any trace of a properly ascetic life. *In order to lie* can either mean, in order thereby to give themselves out as true prophets, to deceive the people by this dress, or in order thereby to procure admission for their lying prophecies. The former is to be preferred on account of the following verse, where, to the former attempts of the false prophets to pass themselves off for the true, is opposed their open confession to the contrary.

V. 5. "*And he says, I am no prophet, I am a husbandman. For a man has sold me from the time of my youth.*" The false prophets were mostly of the lowest order. The ruling motive with them was indolence, which caused them to hate a life of labor; and ambition, which stimulated them to force themselves into the more respectable order of teachers of the people. This appears from Isaiah 9: 13, 14, among other passages, where there is a contrast between the honorable, as the head of the people, and the false prophets as the tail, as the representatives of the rabble. Now at that time the better principle will so gain the ascendency over them, that they will rather wish to appear what they are, even though they are hired husbandmen, than what they formerly aspired to. Calvin: "*Ego non fui in schola, ego bestia eram, et tamen volui videri doctissimus magister; sed tunc stupor populi velavit meam ignominiam; nunc autem lux doctrinæ nobis affulsit, quæ cogit me ad pudorem, et ideo jam fateor, me non esse dignum, qui audiar in cœtu, quia paratus sum manus meas potius exercere vili et sordido labore, ut inde mihi victum accipiam, quam amplius decipere, sicut hactenus feci.*" The prophet represents a scene between a former false prophet and some one who asked him concerning his circumstances, and from whom he sought to conceal with shame, that he had ever been a false prophet, — whence it appears that Calvin has well expressed the inward thought but not the language of the false prophet, — until he is forced, (comp. v. 6) by a new question to this mortifying confession. From this dramatic character of the representation, the double וְאָמַר is explained here and v. 6, without a nearer designation of the person who speaks. In the drama the persons are known from their discourses and actions. הִקְנָנִי has received very different explanations. This however would not have been the case, if it had been taken simply in its usual meaning of Hiphil: קָנָה, *to inherit, to possess*, in Hiphil *to cause to inherit, to possess*, then *to give to any one to be possessed*. In this sense the Hiphil of קָנָה stands in the only passage where it occurs besides, Ezek. 8: 3, on which Cocceius remarks: "*Videtur esse aut anaclasis aut paronomasia: simulacri, quod deum facit zelare, facitque Israelitas servos tradi hostibus.*" The selling of servants, especially of debtors and their whole families, was so common, that the expression כֶּסֶף קִנְיַן became almost the usual appellation of servants; comp. Michaelis, Mos. R., II. § 123. The general designation אָדָם is chosen because the person of the seller was here not important, but only the action, the sale. The

phrase, "from my youth," is intended to obviate the suspicion, that perhaps the present husbandman might formerly have been a prophet. If he were not an independent husbandman, but a servant in the employment of another, even with the best inclination to act the part of a prophet, he was, as it appears, restrained therefrom by outward circumstances. He had better, to be sure, if he wished entirely to set aside the suspicion, not have begun with, "I am no prophet." But the anxiety lest he should be known as a former prophet so overcomes him, that he loses his self-possession, and by the very denial puts the inquirer on the right track.

V. 6. "*The former says: What then are these wounds between thy hands; he says, They were inflicted upon me in the house of my lovers.*" According to several interpreters the former false prophet here proceeds with his falsehood. So Kimchi: "*Non sunt plagæ ob prophetiam inflictæ, sed quibus ab illis, qui me amabant, in puritia castigatus sum, quod deses in colendo agro fuissem.*" According to others, confessing his shame, he says, that the wounds have truly been given him on account of his prophesying, and indeed, as he well perceives, out of true love by his parents. So Jerome: "*In tantum fugato mendacio veritas obtinebit, ut etiam ipse, qui suo punitus est vitio, recte perpessum se esse fateatur.*" Both interpretations, however, are plainly untenable. They take the *part. Pi.* מְאַהֲבָיִם in a good sense, while, in accordance with the character of Piel as an intensive form, (comp. Ewald, p. 196,) it occurs only of impure and base love, either spiritual or corporeal, especially of idols, and indeed so frequently, and moreover chiefly in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, that only extreme necessity could induce us here to relinquish this meaning. We therefore without hesitation agree with those, who here find a reference to the wounds commonly inflicted in idolatrous worship. The chief passages for this custom, which is still continued in modern times in the East, are found in Le Clerc, Calmet, and Dereser, on 1 Kings 18:28. The two last, but incorrectly, cite in its favor Herod. 7, 191, for the ἔντομά τε ποιεῦντες there practised by the Magi, can be regarded as belonging to this practice only by a false interpretation; and further, in Rosenmüller, *A. u. N. Morgenl.* 3, p. 189 ff., and Creuzer, *Symbolik*, II. p. 40. We content ourselves here with showing that this custom also existed in the idolatrous worship, which prevailed among the Hebrews. The chief proof is furnished by the cited passage of Kings, where it is said of the priests and prophets of Baal: "They

cried louder and scratched themselves, after their manner, with knives and awls, until the blood flowed down from them." In proof also is Jeremiah 16 : 6, 41 : 5; according to which the heathenish practice of wounding themselves in their lamentation over the dead or a great public calamity, as it prevailed among the surrounding people, particularly the Philistines and Moabites, (comp. 47 : 5, 48 : 37,) was introduced also among the Hebrews. For this usage was not indeed a mere symbol of distress, but it was closely connected with idolatry and the wounds usually inflicted in the practice of it. This appears from Deut. 14 : 1. There the infliction of wounds in mourning is interdicted to the Israelites on the ground, that, inasmuch as they were the holy people of God, they must not pollute themselves with idolatrous practices. This connexion will be more manifest, if we more closely investigate the origin and import of the practice of inflicting wounds in idolatrous worship. The best disclosure is furnished us by a passage of Apuleius cited by Le Clerc, l. c. : "*Infit vaticinatione clamosa, conficto mendacio, semet ipsum incessere atque criminari, quasi contra fas sanctæ religionis designasset aliquid, et insuper justas pœnas noxii facinoris ipse suis manibus exposcere. Arrepto denique flagro, quod semiviris illis proprium gestamen est . . . . . , indidem sese multimodis commulcat ictibus, mira contra plagarum dolores præsumtione munitus. Cerneres prosectu gladiorum ictuque flagrorum solum spurcitie sanguinis effeminati madescere.*" According to this passage, as well as another of Clem. Alex. in Calmet, the practice of wounding arose from an obscure consciousness of guilt, and the necessity of reconciliation, which manifests itself in such manifold ways in idolatrous worship. Man raged unsparing against his own body, in order thereby to make a sort of satisfaction, and gain for himself the favor of the angry gods. This feeling of guilt, however, was awakened with peculiar vividness by the death of beloved persons, not merely because their loss was regarded as a punishment, but also because death in general, which comes the closer to ourselves the more dear to us its victims, awakens even in the rudest minds an anticipation of what it really is, the wages of the sins of mankind. In like manner also was this feeling awakened by public calamity, so far as this was generally regarded as the punishment of an angry God or angry idols. — We are not, however, without proofs, that this usage stood especially in close connexion with the prophecies of the idolatrous prophets. In this connexion it occurs immediately in the cited passage of Kings,

(comp. v. 29,) as in general the whole of that relation bears testimony to the close connexion of idolatry and false prophecy. The priests of Baal are at the same time his prophets. Especially remarkable, however, is the passage of Tibullus, Lib. I. Eleg. 1, v. 43 sq., concerning the service of Cybele :

> " *Ipsa bipenne suos cædit violenta lacertos,*
> *Sanguineque effusò spargit inepta deum,*
> *Atque latus præfixa veru stat saucia pectus,*
> *Et canit eventus, quos dea magna movet.*"

This connexion is explained by the feeling, that a man must render satisfaction to the divinity for his sins, before he can be worthy to enjoy his favor and be employed in his service. — No consideration is due to the doubt of Rosenmüller, whether מַכּוֹת could be used of these inflictions and the scars arising from them. Apuleius designates them, as we have already seen, by the entirely corresponding *plagæ*. Seneca, in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, 6, 10, says : " *Se ipsi in templis contrucidant, vulneribus suis ac sanguine supplicant.*" An apparent objection might yet be derived from " I have been smitten," while most accounts of this practice speak only of a self-infliction. But it appears from the accounts of more recent travellers, (comp. Olearius, p. 332,) that mutual wounds are given, and " moreover, I have been smitten " does by no means exclude wounding one's self. The former prophet may have chosen the passive intentionally, because he was only the *second cause ;* the *first cause* was the מְאַהֲבִים. The case more closely considered, the prophet himself was chiefly passive in his action. The latter supposition is rendered the more probable by the choice of מְאַהֲבִים as a designation of the idols, which was certainly not accidental. " My lovers " stands manifestly in contrast with " I have been smitten." In a manner entirely similar, the madness of this sort of idolatry is described by Seneca, l. c. : " *Ut sic dii placentur, quemadmodum ne homines quidem sæviunt teterrimi et in fabulas traditæ crudelitatis. Tyranni laceraverunt aliquorum membra, neminem sua lacerare jusserunt. In regiæ libidinis voluptatem castrati sunt quidam ; sed nemo sibi, ne vir esset, jubente domino, manus intulit* " — The connexion of this verse with the foregoing is as follows. The former prophet being asked concerning his occupation, seeks in the first place to remove from himself all suspicion of having abandoned his inferior calling. As however the inquirer reminds him of the suspicious scars which were found upon him, he confesses with shame his former folly, the

consciousness of which he at the same time betrays by his manner. The phrase בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ still requires explanation. According to several interpreters it means precisely, *in the hands*. But this supposition is by no means justified by an appeal to Prov. 26 : 13, "*The lion is* בֵּין הָרְחֹבוֹת." "Between the streets" there signifies out of the streets themselves, their environs, public places, &c. On the other hand, however, we are not justified with Gesenius, *Thes.* s. v., in explaining בין ידין by, "*in corpore tuo, maxime in facie.*" It is true, that such a wider usage is found in Arabic. The phrase بين يدين there signifies "*ante faciem, in conspectu, in præsentia.*" In the *Arabs Erpenii* لِقَفَا is always rendered *thereby;* in the *Vita Timuri* we often find أستقبل بين يدين, *obedientem se stitit coram eo;* comp. Schultens, *Animadvv. Phil.* p. 39, on Job, p. 389. But very much has become obsolete in Arabic, which in Hebrew, and in that only, still occurs in its original import. We had better, as is evident, particularly from a comparison of the cited passage of Proverbs, explain "between thy hands" by "*in* and *near* them." *Between* is then chosen for *in*, to show that not precisely the hands alone are intended; it determines only in general the region, in such a manner however, that the hands are chiefly meant, and that such distant members, as the head or the shoulders, are not to be thought of. That the hands, however, are chiefly mentioned is not indeed owing entirely to the circumstance of their being uncovered, and the wounds upon them therefore chiefly visible. It appears from Jeremiah 48 : 37, where it is said, in the description of the lamentation of the Moabites, עַל כָּל יָדַיִם גְּדֻדוֹת, "Upon all hands are cuts," that the hands were wont especially to be wounded. The passages of the classic writers and the fathers speak chiefly of the arms, which are here certainly included, e. g. "*lacertos secat,*" Seneca; "*sua quisque brachia dissecant,*" Apuleius.

Chap. 13 : v. 7–9.

The shepherd of the Lord, closely united with him, shall be torn away by a violent death from his flock, the covenant people; deprived of the shepherd, the flock shall then disperse, and be given

up to extreme misery. But the Lord will not withdraw his hand from them for ever. He will rather restore his people again to favor after he has cleansed and purified them. First, two thirds shall be taken away by a fearful divine judgment; the remaining third shall then be led by the Lord through the severest trials and purifications, until at last it truly turns to him.

This prophecy forms a brief repetition, and at the same time a supplement, of that in chap. 11 and 12 – 13 : 6. It is in vain to attempt (comp. Mark on v. 7,) to connect it closely with what immediately precedes. It stands in about the same relation to both prophecies as Is. 52: 13 – 15, to chap. 53. It presents us in one view with what had been separated by the length of the preceding representation.

V. 7. "*Sword awake against my shepherd, and against a man, my nearest relation, saith the Lord of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the flock is scattered, and I bring back my hand upon the small.*" There can be no doubt that here, by the shepherd of the Lord, is to be understood the same person united with him by a mysterious unity of being, who, according to chap. 11, undertook the pastoral office over the miserable people, and made the last effort to preserve them, but whose faithfulness was rewarded with base ingratitude, who was even, according to chap. 12 : 10, put to death by them; whose rejection, according to chap. 11, had entirely the same results for the covenant people, as are here attributed to his death, the destruction of the greater part of the people, comp. v. 8 with chap. 11 : 6, 9, 15 – 17; nay, whose death is even represented, chap. 12 : 10, as indirectly the cause of all the sufferings experienced by the people; since repentance for his murder, appears there, as the cause of the deliverance from all these sufferings. Hence it is sufficiently evident, that all those interpretations are to be rejected, which understand by the shepherd any other than the Messiah; whether, as, with most of the Jewish interpreters, (comp. Jos. De Voisin, *Observv. in Prœm. Pug. Fid.* p. 160. Hulsius, *Theol. Jud.* p. 54. Elsner, *Præs. Wessel, de Messiæ Gladio Judicis, non Belli percutiendo.* Leiden, 1741), the ideal pseudo-Messias, Ben Joseph; or, with Jarchi, even a hostile general, who is called by the Lord ironically his shepherd; or, with Grotius on Matt. 26 : 31, "the foolish shepherd,"

of whom chap. 11 : 15 – 17; or, with the same on this passage, who, as is apt to be the case where a man brings forward merely his sudden thoughts, is inconsistent, or, with Jahn (*Einl.* 2, p. 671), Judas Maccabeus; or, with the Rationalist interpreters (comp. Köster l. c. p. 183. Bertholdt, *Einl.* p. 1718. Eichhorn, *Propheten z. d. St.*), an ideal general, who should be slain in battle with the enemy; or lastly, with Calvin and Drusius, the collective body of all the spiritual and civil rulers of the people, Christ being included. — All these interpretations have against them, besides the authority of Christ, the following context: "Against a man, my nearest relation." This would not, to be sure, be the case, if עֲמִית, as is often asserted, could designate a fellow in every relation. The shepherd would be called the fellow of the Lord, because he also is the shepherd of his people. But this supposition is entirely untenable. עֲמִית is one of those words, which, peculiar to the Pentateuch, have entirely disappeared from the later idiom. It occurs in the Pentateuch eleven times, and nowhere else. Hence it appears, that Zechariah took it, as well as אַלִּיף, (comp. on chap. 12 : 5), not from the living language, but from the Pentateuch, and that we must understand it therefore in precisely the sense in which it is there used. It occurs, however, only in the laws respecting the injury of a neighbour, and always with peculiar emphasis, intimating how grievous a crime it is to injure those connected with us by a common corporeal and spiritual origin. It is interchanged as synonymous with *brother*, which in the laws of the Pentateuch uniformly refers to the common corporeal and spiritual descent. We will here cite the eleven passages, in which it occurs. Levit. 19 : 11, "Ye shall not lie nor deceive אִישׁ בַּעֲמִיתוֹ," (comp. Ephes. 4 : 28.) V. 15. "Righteously shalt thou judge עֲמִיתֶךָ." V. 17. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in the heart; thou shalt reprove עֲמִיתֶךָ." Levit. 18 : 20, "Thou shalt not defile אֵשֶׁת עֲמִיתֶךָ." 24 : 19, "When any one inflicts a corporeal injury בַּעֲמִיתוֹ, as he has done, so shall it be done to him." 25 : 15, "When thou buyest any thing of thy *neighbour* or sellest any thing to thy *neighbour*, you shall not injure each one his brother." In like manner, v. 16 and 17, "And ye shall not injure each one his neighbour, and thou shalt fear before thy God." Levit. 5 : 20, "A soul, if it sins and does wickedly against the Lord, and lies against his neighbour (in that which was intrusted to him), — or oppresses his neighbour." We hope every one will concede that עֲמִית in all these places, in a manner entirely different from our word

neighbour, diluted and deprived through sin of its original worth, and for the most part suggesting only any other person, is used to designate the closest possible relation among men, and one which cannot indeed be arbitrarily formed, but comes by birth, and continues even against one's will, and exposes him to condemnation when he violates it. But hence it appears, that, when this designation is transferred to the relation of an individual to God, he cannot possibly be a mere man, but rather he who is united with the Lord by a mysterious unity of nature, and who has already, in chap. 11, 12, as such, so plainly appeared. — For designating him here by the עמית of the Lord, the prophet must have had a peculiar reason, when we consider that עמית occurs exclusively in the laws *de non lædendo proximo*. He thus gives prominence to the apparent contradiction between the command of the Lord, "Sword, awake against my shepherd," and the requisitions of his own law, which forbids any one to injure his neighbour. He shows in this way, how exalted must have been the aim for whose accomplishment the Lord disregarded that relation, whose type he had commanded to be held sacred among men. He directs their attention, to speak after the manner of men, to the greatness of the sacrifice, which this must cost the Lord. The subjoined גֶּבֶר stands in a certain antithesis with עֲמִיתִי. He whom the sword should smite, must combine the human with the divine nature. גֶּבֶר often signifies *man* in contrast with God; comp. Winer, s. v. We need not here, with several interpreters, seek for the associated idea of strength, which the word, like *man* in English, has in several places. — The personification of the sword, in the address to it, finds a complete analogy in the prophecy of Jeremiah against Philistia, chap. 47:6, where the prophet, from human sympathy with the fate of those against whom he prophesies, exclaims: "Ha, sword of the Lord, how long wilt thou not rest; return back into thy sheath; be quiet and still! Yet how canst thou be quiet, since the Lord has commanded it, since against Askalon and against the bank of the sea has he sent it." It is shown by this command, that the Lord is the first cause of the death of his shepherd, that the human authors are only his instruments; as the Lord, John 19:11, says to Pilate: "Thou wouldst have no power against me except it were given thee from above." The expression, *awake*, shows that the sword, in accordance with the personification of it, is to be regarded as hitherto at rest. Schmid: "*Pœnæ istæ hactenus Christum manserunt; nondum fuit iis concessum, ut eum invaderent; jam*

vero æternus pater, solutis quasi vinculis et apertis ubique portis, potestatem iis facit, ut filium suum adoriantur." That the *sword* is called upon to smite the shepherd of the Lord, expresses in like manner as *pierced,* chap. 12 : 10, which intimates not a cut but a stab, only his impending death without defining the manner of it. The sword, as the usual instrument of the judge and the warrior, often stands instead of every fatal instrument, where the instrument itself is not important, but only the infliction of wounds and of death. The most striking example is 2 Sam. 12 : 9, "Thou hast slain him, Uriah, by the sword, בְּחֶרֶב, of the children of Ammon," while, according to 2 Sam. 11 : 24, he was pierced by the *arrows* of the Ammonites. — 2 Sam. 11 : 25, after David receives from Joab the message that several of his people had been slain by the hostile *archers,* he makes him say again : "Let not this thing displease thee ; for the sword devoureth one as well as another ; only make thy battle strong against the city." A similar general use of the sword is found also Exod. 5 : 21, "Ye have made our savour to stink before Pharaoh and his servants, giving the sword into their hands to kill us;" Jerem. 2 : 23, "Your sword has devoured your prophets;" Ps. 22 : 21, "Deliver from the sword my soul" (comp. Vol. I. p. 146.) ; Matt. 26 : 52, "He who takes the sword shall perish by the sword." What murderer would avoid the application of the sentence to himself, which is a repetition of what is expressed in altogether general terms, Gen. 9 : 6, on the ground that he had killed his neighbour, not by the sword, but by another instrument? According to the same idiom the right of the magistrates among the Romans to inflict every kind of capital punishment, was called the *jus gladii.* — The address, "Smite the shepherd," according to several interpreters, is no longer directed to the sword ; Michaelis, "*Percute, quisquis percuties ;*" but the fact, that חֶרֶב is feminine, gives no justification for this, since there is here a personification, comp. e. g. Gen. 4 : 7, where sin, personified as a ravenous beast, is construed as masculine. — "*Smite the shepherd, and then the herd will disperse.*" Is the shepherd either in the natural or spiritual sense slain, the flock is wont to disperse. The prophet seems here to have special reference to 1 Kings 22 : 17, where the prophet Micah says to Jehoshaphat and Ahab, predicting the death of the latter : "I saw all Israel scattered on the hills as a flock, which has no shepherd : and the Lord said, These have no shepherd, let them return each one to his house in peace ;" comp. 1 Macc. 9 : 18 : *Καὶ*

Ἰούδας ἔπεσε· καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἔφυγον. By a misunderstanding of the New Testament citations of the passage, many interpreters have been led to take the *flock* here in too limited a sense, and refer only to a part, what belongs to the whole. Thus the *Dialogus cum Tryphone* understands by the flock only the disciples of the Lord, and finds the complete fulfilment in their flight after his arrest. Ambrose finds it in the dispersion of the apostles into all lands, and in their preaching the doctrine of Christ. (Serm. II. in Ps. 118.) According to Michaelis, the flock are *apostoli, aliique Judæi, in Christum Jesum credentes*, as Jerome long before understood thereby *omnem in Christo multitudinem credentium*. This limitation, however, is equally as incorrect as the opposite one of the converted R. Samuel, *Liber de Adventu Messiæ*, (in the *Monumenta Orthodoxographa*, Basel, 1555, p. 1302 sq.) chap. 19, who appears to understand, by the flock, exclusively the ungodly part of the people to be scattered by the Romans: "*Crucifixo Christo, qui pastor erat, Judæos dispersos esse per orbem terræ, postquam capti et venditi sunt Romanis.*" The true sense of the passage was seen by Wessel, l. c. and Mark. *The* flock must embrace the sheep collectively, which *the* shepherd had to feed. These however were not, according to chap. 11, the believers alone, but the *whole* Jewish people, see especially on v. 7; the most miserable sheep, who regarded the shepherd, appear v. 11, only as one part of this flock. Still more decisive however is what follows. The flock are plainly the small, who are represented immediately afterwards as an object of further divine care. But, that we cannot by these understand the believers only, or indeed the apostles, without destroying the whole connexion between v. 7 and v. 8, 9, we shall soon see. Accordingly, under the image of sheep without a shepherd, the whole Jewish people after the death of the Messiah, are here described. In what manner, and how long they were without a shepherd, and consequently wretched, depended on their spiritual condition, and on the corresponding dealings of the Lord. The desertion of the apostles and other believers by their shepherd, was only temporary; the Lord soon returned to them. The unbelieving portion of the people still wander about as sheep, who have no shepherd. — The phrase, "to bring back the hand upon any one," i. q., to make him either the object of an action, or an operation, is of itself indefinite; and whether it stands in a good or a bad sense, must in every case be decided by the connexion. Several interpreters here assume the latter, after the Chaldee, the Seventy, and the

Greek interpreters, who follow them. This supposition appears at first sight to be favored by what follows; since in v. 8 the discourse relates to a heavy judgment to be inflicted on the dispersed flock. But on a closer examination we find that the former interpretation is the only correct one. The judgment described in v. 8, according to another mode of considering the subject, was a proof of the farther exercise of the special providence of God over the people; God thereby realized the condition, on which alone they could be restored to their ancient gracious relation to him, and become again the people of God. Every judgment upon the ungodly is indeed a benefit to the church of the Lord. That this view here prevails, appears sufficiently evident from v. 9; it is also evident from "the small." For this designation intimates the sympathy of the Lord with the wretched condition of the poor sheep, just as, chap. 11: 7, the shepherd undertakes to feed the flock, because they are the most miserable sheep. We find the same mode of representation in Malachi. After the prophet, chap. 3: 1–5, has announced a great purifying judgment upon the covenant people, he adduces v. 6, as a reason for it, the covenant faithfulness of the Lord, who could not suffer his people to go to utter ruin, as must necessarily have been the case without this judgment. Still more exactly parallel, even in the expression, and perhaps distinctly in the view of Zechariah, is the passage, Is. 1: 24, &c.: "I will take vengeance on my adversaries (the ungodly members of the Theocracy) and *I will bring back my hand upon thee* (the church of the Lord), and purify, as alkali (purifies), all thy dross, and take away all thy sin. — Then shalt thou be called a city of righteousness, a faithful city." That the expression, "*I will bring back my hand upon thee*," stands here in a good sense, of the gracious benefit which the Lord confers upon his people by their purification, while he seemed to have forsaken them, so long as he neglected this, has been so strikingly proved by Vitringa, that Gesenius, when without proof he takes it in a bad sense, can scarcely have read him. There is indeed between Zion in v. 25, and the enemies of God in v. 24, a manifest antithesis, precisely as in v. 27 and 28. — הַצְּעָרִים are here *the small* in the figurative sense, the miserable, the same, who, chap. 11: 7, had been called the most miserable sheep. That the trope is not here to be dissolved, that after *the small* we are rather to supply *sheep*, appears from the צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאן, *the smallest of the sheep*, as a designation of a miserable people, in Jer. 49: 20, 50: 45. In Jer. 14: 3, the synonymous

צָעִיר stands opposed to אַדִּיר. "And their nobles send their little ones to the waters." Also Jer. 48:4-14, עָעוֹר, which the Masorites wish to change without reason into the more frequent צָעִיר, denotes the wretchedness of their condition; comp. also Ps. 119:41, "I am small and despised." The form in the passage before us occurs besides only in the name of the city Zoar. The ancient translators, the Greek as well as the Chaldee, have, as we have already remarked, taken "I bring back my hand," in a bad sense, and then understand, by *the small*, the inferior, in contrast with the chief shepherd of the people. According to this entirely arbitrary interpretation, which has led some, in reference to the Seventy, to the supposition, refuted by Buxtorf, that they had before them another reading, Theodoret gives the sense: *Καὶ ἐπιστρέψω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς μικροὺς ποιμένας, τοὺς ὄνομα ποιμένων ἔχοντας, ἱερεῖς καὶ διδασκάλους, τοῦ δὲ πράγματος ἐρήμους ὑπάρχοντας.* The bringing back of the hand of the Lord upon the small, here promised, was first experienced by the apostles, and all those, who at that time from among the Jews, became believers in Christ, or who have become such in all succeeding centuries down to the present day. In another way, by the unbelieving part of the people also; for the judgments, which the Lord inflicts upon them, are on the one side indeed punishments of his justice, on the other side, however, manifestations and means of his mercy; until at last, when all Israel is saved, the bringing back of his hand upon them is most illustriously manifested, and our prophecy receives its complete fulfilment. — We now cast a look at the New Testament citations of the passage. The chief place is Matt. 26:31, 32, (comp. Mark 14:27): *Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ· γέγραπται γάρ· πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.* Here the original is followed, not the Septuagint. The figurative mode of representation retained by these, the address to the sword, the Lord resolves into literal language: "*I* will smite." The last words, as the *δὲ* intimates, are of a consoling character; an annunciation, that the Lord, after a short interruption, would resume his pastoral office over the apostles and the other believers, and therefore an individualizing of the expression in Zechariah, "I bring back my hand upon them." Hence it appears, that the phrase, "I bring back the hand," was taken by the Lord in a good sense, and that he understood by the *small* sheep, not *shep-*

herds, according to the misunderstanding of all Greek interpreters, (*Aq.* *ἐπὶ τοὺς ποιμένας βραχεῖς.* Sym. and Seventy, *μικρούς.* Theod. *νεωτέρους*) and the Chaldee. That the special application of what is said in Zechariah concerning the dispersion of the flock, to the apostles, does not exclude its wider import and reference, we have already seen. — But how great stress the Lord laid on the passage, appears from his having before used its words when predicting what was to happen to his disciples, without expressly citing them, as he does here, because they had not rightly understood the former reference. He says, John 16 : 32 : *Ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν, ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐμὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε.* Allusions are found perhaps 10 : 13, 11 : 52 (comp. Lampe, III. p. 351), and Luke 12 : 32.

V. 8. "*And it comes to pass in the whole land, saith the Lord, two parts in the same are extirpated and die, and the third part remains therein.*" After Jerome, Mark and others would strangely understand by הָאָרֶץ "the whole earth." The article rather points to the land, with which the prophet had constantly been concerned in the preceding context, over whose inhabitants the shepherd of the Lord had undertaken the pastoral office; comp. 7 : 5, 12 : 12. The true interpretation was seen by Theodoret and Cyril. — The expression פִּי־שְׁנַיִם is here, as 2 Kings 2 : 9, taken from Deut. 21 : 7. It signifies properly, *a mouth*, i. q. *a mouthful*, *a mouth-portion of two*, and originated in the custom of placing before those who were to be honored, a double, or even a larger portion of food; comp. Gen. 43 : 34; Rosenmüller, *A. u. N. Morgenl.*, I. p. 207. It then serves, Deut. l. c., in a metaphorical sense, to designate the share of the first-born in the inheritance, who received a double portion. In this metaphorical sense, פִּי for *portion*, *part* in general, the word does not elsewhere occur; and there is no doubt, that Elisha, l. c., when, as the first-born of Elias in a spiritual sense, he desires a double portion of his spiritual inheritance, and our prophet also, borrowed the expression directly from Deuteronomy. The whole Jewish people appears here as an inheritance, left behind by the shepherd, who has been slain, which is divided into three parts; of which death, asserting the right of the first-born, receives two, and life one, a division similar to that, which, 2 Sam. 8 : 2, was made of the Moabites by David. "And David smote the Moabites, and measured them with the measuring line, casting them down to the ground, and measured two parts for death and one part for life." — The double por-

tion of the inheritance of death is then divided again among the two different kinds of the same. For that we cannot with Mark explain יִכָּרֵתוּ יִגְוָעוּ by *excidentur, ut exspirent*, or *excidendo exspirabunt*, so that the latter indicates only a necessary consequence of the former, but must rather with Vatablus and Drusius interpret, "*Pars una succidetur gladio, et pars altera exspirabit peste, aut alio genere mortis,*" is shown by the parallel passage, Ezek. 5 : 12 : "A third part of thee shall die with the pestilence, and with famine shall they all be consumed in the midst of thee ; and a third part shall fall by the sword round about thee ; and I will scatter a third part into all the winds ; and I will draw out a sword after them." Accordingly, therefore, יִכָּרֵתוּ designates death by the hostile sword, and יִגְוָעוּ death by pestilence, accompanied with war and the siege, and by famine. This coincidence with Ezekiel, however, is not by any means accidental, or consisting merely in the expression. The prophet rather here resumes the whole prediction, Ezek. chap. 5, and announces a second fulfilment of it, just as we have before shown to have been the case in reference to a similar one of Jeremiah, (comp. on chap. 11 : 13.) Ezekiel had threatened the people, that the Lord would make a threefold division of them on account of their sins ; for the sword, for pestilence and for famine, for dispersion. This threatening had now already been fulfilled, but the people still suffered the consequences of this judgment, as the prophet here announces to them, that on account of their renewed apostasy the Lord would make a new threefold division, as he afterwards actually did by the Romans. Isaiah, some hundred years before, had already comprehended the contents of both prophecies in the remarkable picture of the fortunes of the covenant people, which was presented to his inward contemplation, when he was consecrated to the prophetic office. He predicts, chap. 6 : 11, in the first place the entire desolation of the land, and the carrying away of its inhabitants into distant regions. This cannot possibly refer to any thing else than the Babylonish exile. The predictions of the prophet in reference to the predecessors of the Chaldeans, the Syrians, and Assyrians, announced from the beginning, prosperity. This part of the prediction is accordingly, in Ezek. chap. 5, more fully carried out. It is further asserted : "Again there is in the land a tenth part of its former inhabitants, but it shall be destroyed anew." It is self-evident, that by this tenth part is not to be understood the few people of the lowest order, who, according to Jer. chap. 40,

under the superintendence of Gedaliah, were left behind in the land by the Chaldeans. These were much too unimportant to be noticed in this very general sketch. We are rather obliged to refer it to the new destruction of the national independence of the people by the Romans. The phrase, "a tenth part," here accurately expresses, as the nature of the case required, the relation of the returned exiles to the former citizens of Judah. This second destruction is that of which Zechariah here speaks. What Isaiah moreover predicted of the holy seed, which should be preserved amidst the ruin of the whole people, and attain to prosperity, completely harmonizes with v. 9. — *The third part.* The foregoing indefinite *two parts* is defined by the article. For, if besides two parts, only *the third part* still remains, these two parts must be two thirds. Overlooking this, Winer asserts, s. v. כִּי, erroneously, that פִּי־שְׁנַיִם, otherwise than in the remaining places, here designates precisely *two thirds.* It first appears by הַשְּׁלִישִׁית, that two parts of a whole divided into three parts are intended.

V. 9. "*And I bring the third part into the fire, and purify them, as silver is purified, and prove them, as gold is proved. They will call upon my name and I will hear them. I say, They are my people; and they answer, Jehovah my God.*" — "To cause to go through the fire," is the techinal term for the purification of metals, comp. Num. 31: 23; "I purify them," &c., indicates, both how highly the Lord esteems those who are to be purified, — they are compared with the most precious metals, — and how difficult this purification is, how greatly the furnace of affliction must be heated for them. That the latter idea is not to be excluded, is shown by the passage Is. 48: 10; "Behold, I have purified thee, yet *not* as silver, I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction." While the Lord there declares, that he would be satisfied, if, by the Babylonish exile, only the coarsest dross of sin was separated, if among the people only the first beginnings of true repentance and a new life appeared; that he would not purify them as silver, which, if it is to be entirely cleansed, must be melted seven times (comp. Ps. 12: 7), but before the purification is entirely completed, while they are still in the furnace of affliction, he will receive them again into favor; — he here declares of the second purification, directly the opposite. — The Lord will not be satisfied with this until he has removed *all* dross. Precisely as here the verbs צָרַף and בָּחַן are combined, Jer. 9: 6; see besides 6: 30, Ps. 76: 10, Ezek. 22: 18, Job 23: 10. — The

phrase קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה has the double meaning, to call *out* the name of the Lord with emotion, to praise him, comp. 1 Chron. 16 : 8, with Is. 44 : 5, and in the same manner to call *upon* the name of the Lord. In both cases the בְּ is a designation of the object on which the emotion of him, who calls *out*, or who calls *upon*, rests; properly *to call upon* or *to call out*, since it is the name of the Lord, with which one has to do, which is not to be regarded as "mere sound and vapor," but as a copy and outward representation of his nature. Of course, therefore, the expression קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, is not simply synonymous with קָרָא יְהוָה, or קָרָא אֶל יְהוָה The former can never, like the latter, refer to the ungodly, who call upon the Lord hypocritically, or at least only outwardly and superficially. It stands therefore also Is. 64 : 6, with entire suitableness in the parallelism with "to take hold upon the Lord." It is mentioned in Joel 3 : 5, as the only condition of salvation: "Every one who calls upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved." "He will call upon my name, and I will hear him," forms an antithesis with, "And as he called and they did not hear, so they call and I hear not, saith the Lord." Chap. 7 : 13. In the last words the preter אָמַרְתִּי is intentionally joined with the *fut.* יֹאמַר, (properly, as Rückert, "I have spoken, My people is he; and he says, Jehovah, my God,") to indicate that, the speaking of the Lord must necessarily precede that of the people; precisely as, according to chap. 12 : 10, the people first offer up prayer to the Lord, and are seized with deep distress for their sins, after the Lord has poured out upon them the spirit of grace. The two modes accordingly signify a relative past and future, just as, Is. chap. 53, the suffering of the servant of God is expressed mostly by præters, the glorification by futures, although in reality both were still future. Parallel, even in respect to this interchange of *præt.* and *fut.*, is Hos. 2 : 25, "And I say to them, who are not my people, My people thou; and they will say, My God."

Chap. 14.

A new scene presents itself to the prophet. All people of the earth are assembled by the Lord against his holy city; this is taken; the greatest part of its inhabitants are cut off by the sword, or carried away into captivity, v. 1, 2. Then, however, the Lord interferes for his people, hitherto preserved uninjured, by his wonderful providence, and the judgment is suddenly directed from the church of the Lord to her enemies. The Lord appears in majesty upon the Mount of Olives, and while an earthquake announces his coming to judgment, and fills all with terror, the mountain divides in the midst, so that henceforth the people of the Lord find a safe and easy way of flight through the lengthened valley of Jehoshaphat. Then the Lord appears, with all his saints, to establish his kingdom on the earth, v. 3 – 5. At first, thick darkness reigns; then follows, for a short time, a mixture of light and darkness, a twilight; and lastly, when least expected, breaks the full day of salvation for the elect, v. 6, 7. Then a stream of living water pours itself forth from Jerusalem through the whole land, communicating life and fruitfulness, v. 8. The Theocracy, hitherto confined to one single land, now embraces the whole earth, v. 9. In order that Jerusalem alone may be exalted, all hills in the whole land are levelled, the city rises in splendor from its ruins, henceforth secure from every change, to enjoy the divine favor, v. 10, 11. After the enemies, who have besieged Jerusalem, have been chastised by a divine judgment, v. 12 – 15, the remnant of them will turn to the Lord, and annually come to Jerusalem, there to celebrate the feast of tabernacles, v. 16. A heavy punishment will overtake those who neglect this duty, v. 17 – 19. The distinction between the profane and sacred will then entirely cease, and also the mingling of the pious and ungodly, as it existed in the former Theocracy, v. 20, 21.

The interpreters mostly suppose this prophecy to be only a resumption and farther extension of that contained in chap. 12; comp. e. g. Michaelis on the passage, Hitzig, l. c. p. 40. But, for this opinion, there is in the first place no ground whatever. The prophecy receives an entirely new addition; of a connexion with chap. 12, and a reference to it, there is no trace. Both prophecies give a cycle of events independent of one another, in which what follows is always connected with what precedes, by the constantly recurring *in*

this day. On the contrary, there are not wanting grounds for the opposite assumption, that the two prophecies refer to different events and times. In chap. 12, Jerusalem appears indeed as closely besieged, but not as taken; from the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the princes of Judah, acccording to v. 5, expect deliverance. From them, according to v. 6, 7, the enemy is vanquished without the city, and before he could take it. Here, on the contrary, the help of the Lord does not come until the city has been taken, and the greatest part of the inhabitants carried away into captivity. According to chap. 14 : 14, Judah fights *in* Jerusalem. According to chap. 12 : 7, he gains the victory without the city, which is thus delivered. Of such splendid promises for the people of the Lord after the overthrow of their enemies, as we here find, there is in chap. 12 no trace; all continues in the usual track. The result, thus obtained by internal evidence, is confirmed also by a comparison of the Apocalypse. There, a twofold great oppression of the church of God in the last times is plainly described. The first, chap. 19 : 19 – 21. Then follows the so-called reign of a thousand years, a condition of the church better than the preceding, but still without a removal of the existing earthly relations. To this period chap. 12 refers. The second, chap. 20 : 8, 9. Tempted by Satan, the heathen nations from all the four ends of the earth, once more surround the camp of the saints and the beloved city. That this prophecy, as well as that of Ezekiel, chap. 37 and 38, is thus parallel with the one before us, and of course that *it*, and not that of chap. 12, must be compared with that of Ezekiel, appears from the fact, that here, altogether the same results of the victory granted by the Lord are mentioned, as there. According to Zechariah, in like manner as Ezekiel and the Apocalypse, Jerusalem is gloriously rebuilt immediately after, the Lord establishes in her his dwelling-place, there will be no more exile, a stream of living water goes forth from her, all the ungodly are excluded, &c.

V. 1. "*Behold a day comes to the Lord, and thy booty is divided in the midst of thee.*" The phrase יוֹם־בָּא לַיהוָה is not to be explained, "the day of the Lord comes," (Rückert, "Behold the day of Jehovah comes,") for the ל can stand instead of *stat. constr.* only when this cannot be used, therefore only when an indefinite thing is

to be designated; while the second noun, however, as here *Jehovah*, is definite, comp. Ewald, p. 582, 603; therefore, not "*a* day of the Lord," for then we cannot see why יוֹם should not be joined with לַיהוָה; rather, "a day comes to the Lord," so that לַיהוָה belongs to בָּא. The designated day, however, comes to the Lord, not only in so far as he introduces it, but also and chiefly, in so far as he is glorified in it. All other days have come rather to men, this alone is proper to the Lord. Thus it is said, Ezek. 39 : 13, of the day of the overthrow of Gog, יוֹם הִכָּבְדִי, "the day of my being honored, saith the Lord." Thus, according to Is. 2 : 12, the day of the Lord comes upon all that is high and exalted, and, according to v. 17, the Lord alone is exalted in that day. — As a day of the Lord is almost always spoken of in reference to the judgments to be executed by him, the question arises whether these judgments, which serve to glorify the Lord, here overtake merely the heathen nations, or whether the sufferings of the church of God here described, are to be considered as chastisements; whether we are therefore to assume, that after the great outpouring of the Spirit and regeneration, described chap. 12 : 10, 13 : 6, a predominance of the tares among the wheat, a mingling of true believers and of hypocrites in the church of God, is again to be expected, so that here the last glorifying of the church of God is described, the last verifying of the proverb, that judgment must begin at the house of God. This latter supposition is indisputably correct. It receives confirmation particularly from v. 2. The prophet shows already by the expression, that those who are carried away into captivity, are not to be regarded as suffering innocently, that those who are outwardly cut off are rather also spiritually cut off, and those who are outwardly retained, as also inwardly quickened. — *Thy spoil.* The prophet addresses Jerusalem, the seat of the kingdom of God at his time, under whose image this kingdom presented itself to his inward vision, exactly as in the Apocalypse. How little we are here to adhere to the letter, is evident from the figurative character of the whole description, which no one can deny; especially the impossibility that all nations of the whole earth should be collected against the outward Jerusalem to battle, and, after being vanquished, should annually go up there, in order to celebrate the feast of tabernacles, &c. — *In thy midst.* Strengthening this, Jerome says, "*Solet frequenter accidere, ut quæ subito impetu in civitate direpta sunt, foris in agro, aut in solitudine dividantur, ne forte hostes superveniant; his autem tan-*

tum malorum pondus incumbet, ut, quæ direpta sunt, in civitatis medio dividantur pro securitate victoriæ." The strange *quid pro quo* of the Chaldee, "*divident filii Israel opes populorum in medio tui Jerusalem,*" sufficiently shows itself as such by the comparison of v. 2. The opinion of Mark, who, after several others, particularly the fathers (Theod., Cyril, Euseb. *Demonstr.* 6. 18, Jerome), here finds the description of the captivity by the Romans, is already sufficiently refuted by the fact, that it requires the prophet, in v. 3, to make a sudden transition from the literal to the spiritual Zion.

V. 2. "*And I collect all the heathen against Jerusalem to battle, and the city is taken, and the houses plundered, and the women dishonored, and the half of the city go forth as captives, and the remnant of the people is not cut off from the city.*" We will not here engage in doctrinal inquiries, how it can be reconciled that the same effect, the collection of the heathen against Jerusalem, which is here attributed to God, is, in the Apocalypse 20 : 8, attributed to Satan, a phenomenon which is known to be often met with in the Scriptures If, however, God must employ the evil as a means of realizing his purpose concerning the world ; if Satan, who appears in Job in poetic representation among the angels of God, is, though against his own will, his servant, as Ashur is called the rod of anger in his hand, Nebuchadnezzar, his servant ; if, without the will of God, he cannot hurt a single hair of the church of God, the constant aim of his assaults (comp. chap. 3) ; it easily appears that the contradiction is only apparent, and such as daily occurs, without any one thinking it necessary to deny the one or the other side of the antithesis. — The Lord collects the nations to the judgment in the first instance upon Jerusalem and then upon themselves. Parallel is Ezek. 39 : 2, "The Lord brings Gog out of the extreme north, and conducts him to the mountains of Israel, there to destroy him." אֶל does not stand as Rosenmüller asserts, for עַל, but it designates merely the direction according to which the heathen were collected. The hostile purpose is first expressed by the following "to war." The phrase, "The houses are plundered, and the women dishonored," is taken from Is. 13 : 16, יְשֻׁסּוּ בָתֵּיהֶם וּנְשֵׁיהֶם תִּשָּׁגַלְנָה׃ — The following member is translated by most interpreters, "And the half of the city shall go forth into captivity." And we here avail ourselves of an opportunity to correct a very ancient error of commentators and lexicographers, (comp. even Ewald, p. 315.) It is altogether a mistake, that גּוֹלָה, a word which it is remarkable never occurs in the Pentateuch,

although the thing signified is there so often spoken of, and except in Amos 1 : 15, only in the writings composed during the exile, ever signifies *captivity*. Even the form, the *partic. femin.*, should have made critics distrustful of this opinion. For the participial form can never constitute abstract nouns; comp. Ewald, p. 236, 237. The standing phrase יָצָא בַגּוֹלָה should have been another ground of suspicion; comp., besides this passage, Amos 1 : 15, Jer. 48 : 7, 11. For, although בְּ often stands with verbs of motion, when the thing moved remains in the place or in the condition, yet there is no instance in which this connexion is so regular and uniform. The following is the correct view. הַגּוֹלָה, *the captive*, relates to the personification of the people carried away into captivity, as of a woman, as we see, e. g., the figure thoroughly carried out in Is. 47. It is a continuation of this trope, when, in the Book of Ezra, in numerous places, the posterity of those who have been carried away are designated as "sons of the captive." For that we are not, as is commonly done, to translate, "sons of the captivity," appears from Ezra 8 : 35 : "Those who had come out of the captivity, the sons of the captive, present a burnt offering to God." If we there translate, "the sons of the captivity," an empty tautology arises; comp. also 2 : 1 : "These are the sons of the city, who returned out of *the captive*, which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away." Of all the passages which Winer and Gesenius (*Thes.* s. v.) cite, for the meaning *captivity*, the only plausible one is 1 Chron. 5 : 22. But, even there, עַד הַגּוֹלָה, since the interpretation *usque ad exilium* is so groundless, can be very well translated "to the captive." Accordingly, therefore, בַּגּוֹלָה in this passage signifies *in captiva*, "being in their condition as captives."—"*The* captive," with the article, on account of the antithesis with that part of the people, who had remained behind in the city, mentioned in what follows. — "*And the remnant of the people will not be exterminated from the city.*" There is here a plain contrast with the former judgment upon Jerusalem, executed by the Babylonians. The advantage enjoyed by those who remained behind, at the first deportation, over those who were carried away, was only apparent; it was only a reprieve: it was here to be real and lasting. The prophet alludes to the similar passages even in the expression (comp. Jer. 29 : 16), "For thus saith the Lord to the king, who sits on the throne of David, and to the whole people who dwell in this city, your brethren, אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָצְאוּ אִתָּכֶם בַּגּוֹלָה, behold, I send upon them the sword, and the famine, and the pestilence, and

scatter them in all the kingdoms of the earth." 2 Kings 25 : 11 : וְאֶת יֶתֶר הָעָם חַגּוֹשְׁאִרִים נָעִיר, "were carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar." The expression, "He will not be exterminated from the city," is chosen in reference to the forms continually occurring in the Pentateuch וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, or מִתּוֹךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, or וְנִכְרַת מֵעַמֶּיהָ. The carrying away of the half into captivity was at the same time a cutting of them off from the city, from the Theocracy, because this carrying away overtook them as a deserved divine judgment.* The portion of the people who remained true to the Lord were saved from this judgment. That, apart from this reference, the phrase, "He is *cut off* from the city," is not to be explained, with Winer, by *ex urbe patria ejectus, in exilium actus est*, is self-evident. As parallel in sense we have yet to compare Isaiah 4 : 3 : "Every one who shall be left behind in Zion and remain in Jerusalem, he shall be called holy, every one who is enrolled for life in Jerusalem." Here, also, to be spared during the judgment of God, and to be a true member of his kingdom, are interchangeable ideas.

V. 3. The purification of the church of God is now completed, and the Lord, following the course of his love towards her, can grant her deliverance and prosperity. — "*And the Lord goes forth, and fights against those heathen, as in his day of conflict, in the day of battle.*" יָצָא is a military technical term, comp. Is. 42 : 13 ; "The Lord will go forth as a hero, as a man of war, awaken zeal." Hab. 3 : 13, "Thou goest forth for the salvation of thy people." More as a general contrast to the rest, in which the Lord seems to indulge, so long as he delivers up his church a prey to her oppressors, יָצָא occurs in the passage, — very explanatory of the relation of the verse before us to the preceding, — Is. 26 : 20, 21 : "Up, my people, go into thy closets, shut thy doors after thee. Wait but a little, until my anger is overpast. For behold, the Lord goeth out from his place to punish the wickedness of the inhabitants of the earth

* The extirpation from the Theocracy, threatened against the transgressors of the law, is by no means to be limited to the punishment of death ; comp., on the contrary, Ezr. 7 : 26, 10 : 8 ; but, which the general expression implies, referred to every thing, whereby God, according to the different degrees of their guilt, either immediately, or through the instrumentality of the magistracy established by him, expels his disobedient subjects from his kingdom. The correctness of this remark will be confirmed by an independent examination of the subject.

against him." נִלְחַם with בְּ of a person, always "to strive *against* any one"; see on v. 14. The translation of the Seventy, *Καὶ ἐξελεύσεται κύριος καὶ παρατάξεται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐκείνοις*, has served to strengthen Theodoret and Cyril in their mistaken reference of the prophecy to the destruction by the Romans. The former remarks: *Παρατάξεται δὲ, οὐχ Ἰουδαίων ὑπερμαχῶν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐκεῖνον στρατηγῶν.* The phrase, "as in the day of his combat," &c., is explained by most interpreters, "as he is wont to combat," and referred to all the combats, which the Lord engaged in for his people; comp. e. g. Jos. 10: 10, Judges 4: 15, 20, 1 Sam. 7: 10. Others, on the contrary, assume a special reference to the combat of the Lord against the Egyptians. So, after the example of the Chaldee, Jerome: "*Nunc egreditur et prœliatur, sicut in die certaminis, quando Pharaonem in mari submersit rubro, et pro Israelitico populo dimicavit.*" This latter reference is plainly to be preferred. For we are led to one particular event by the expression, "as in his day of combat"; the *suff.* refers to the compound idea. The judgment of the Lord upon the Egyptians is expressly called a combat, a fight, Exod. 14: 14, 15: 3 sq. And the deliverance from Egypt so far surpasses all later ones, that it is considered as *the* deliverance, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and those of a later period, in order to designate their greatness, are compared with it, without distinguishing them by a more particular description from the rest; comp. especially Is. 11: 11: "Then will the Lord stretch out his hand a *second time*," &c. Among the weapons with which the Lord contends, only the earthquake, and corruption inflicted upon his enemies, are here mentioned; Ezekiel is more full in the description of them.

V. 4. "*And his feet stand in that day on the Mount of Olives, which lies before Jerusalem, eastward, and the Mount of Olives is split in the midst, from east to west, a very great valley, and a half of the mountain gives way towards the north, and a half towards the south.*" The question arises, why the Lord appears here as standing precisely on the Mount of Olives. The answer is furnished by the subjoined, "which lies before Jerusalem eastward." For these words, as a mere geographical notice for the contemporaries of the prophet, who had the Mount of Olives always in view, would have been entirely superfluous; they could designate the position of the mountain only for the purpose of intimating that this gave the Lord occasion to select it for his station. The Mount of Olives lay before and above Jerusalem, it afforded the best position for overlooking the city, from

it therefore the Lord orders the battle against his enemies found in it, and adopts his measures for the deliverance of his people; from there particularly, he, before whom the mountains flow down, makes for them a way of escape, that they may not be judged with the ungodly heathen. Entirely unmeaning, therefore, is the remark of Burk: "*Textus montem sic præcise et determinate describit, ut ne ad allegoriam dilabatur interpres.*" That the cleaving of the mountain is to be regarded as the effect of an earthquake, seems to be implied in v. 5. The earthquake is also mentioned, Is. 29 : 6, among the punishments which the Lord inflicts on the enemies of Zion: "By the Lord shalt thou be visited with thunder and earthquake (רַעַשׁ), and a loud voice, with storm and wind, and with the flame of a consuming fire." The passage, however, which the prophet seems to have distinctly in view, is that of Ezek. 38 : 19, 20, "In that day there will be a great earthquake over the land of Israel. And before me quaked the fish of the sea, and the fowls of heaven, and the beasts of the field, and every multitude that throngs the earth, and all men, which are on the earth; and the mountains will be destroyed and the hills fall, and every wall will fall to the earth." This earthquake, threatening destruction to the enemies, is a signal for flight to the believers. For they fear to be consumed by the divine judgment with the heathen, in the midst of whom they are placed; as the prophet admonishes the exiles still in Babylon to flee in haste, that they may not be likewise smitten by the judgments which threaten her; comp. 2 : 10: "Ha! ha, escape from the north country;" v. 11: "Ha, Zion deliver thyself, thou inhabitant of the city of Babel." And, as Jeremiah had already done before him, chap. 51 : 6: "Flee out of Babel and deliver each one his soul, that ye be not destroyed each one for his misdeeds, for it is the time of vengeance for the Lord, he renders to her the reward." — While the believers therefore are desiring flight, the Lord opens for them the way by the same earthquake that brings destruction to the enemy. Whoever, as in the present instance, where there was a real danger in delay, wished to escape by speedy flight from Jerusalem, met with no inconsiderable hindrance in the Mount of Olives, bordering on the valley of Jehoshaphat, which David in his flight had to ascend, (comp. 2 Sam. 15 : 30.) This was removed when the Lord divided the mountain; the flying multitude of believers rushed through the lengthened valley of Jehoshaphat, and now, when they were beyond the reach of the divine judgments, these fell with unrestrained vio-

lence upon the enemies of God, as formerly upon Sodom, when Lot had reached Zoar. That the whole representation is figurative, that the main thought, the deliverance of the believers, and the destruction of the enemies, is merely clothed in imagery taken from the local relations of Jerusalem, is so obvious, that whoever does not see it without farther proof, is hardly capable of being convinced. In reference to the manner of the division of the mountain, considerable errors are found in several interpreters, particularly Theodoret and Cyril, who are led astray by the false translation of the Seventy, and Jerome, whose words Rosenmüller gives without further comment, and of course without remarking, that they darken instead of illuminating the text. They falsely assume a fourfold division. Theodoret: *Εἶτα λέγει, ὅτι διαιρεθήσεται τετραχὰ τὸ ὄρος, ὡς τὸ μὲν κατ' ἀνατολὰς, τὸ δὲ κατὰ δυσμὰς, τὸ δὲ κατὰ βορρᾶν, τὸ δὲ κατὰ νότον χωρῆσαι.* But it is only one simple division of the mountain, which is spoken of, in which, in much the same manner as formerly, when the Jordan was divided, the one half goes towards the north, the other towards the south, and so from west to east, from Jerusalem towards the Jordan, a great valley is formed. מֵהֶצְיוּ is rightly explained by Mark: "*Non ab hoc, aut illo latere, aut parte extrema tantum, neque in plures partes, quam duas, sed medius in duas fere æquales.*" "Towards the east and towards the west," does not indeed point out the direction in which the two halves draw back, but the direction of the opening; the mountain was not cleaved in its length, but breadth. An occasion for this mistake has been given by not observing the מִן in מֵהֶצְיוּ. Lastly, we are still informed whither the two halves recede, not indeed toward the west, for then the miracle would not have availed believers, but towards the north and south. גֵּיא, instead of the more usual גַּיְא, (comp. Ewald, p. 453,) is regarded by most interpreters as *accus.* to "a valley," but it can well be taken as *nominat.* in opposition to the noun implied in what precedes, *rent, fissure.*

V. 5. "*And ye flee into my mountain valley; for it will reach to Azal, as ye fled before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah the king of Judah, and there comes the Lord my God, all holy ones with thee.*" גֵּיא־הָרַי, not, with Mark, *per vallem*, but *ad vallem.* פִּי, which appears to confirm the former interpretation, is explained according to the second, which alone can be grammatically justified by the circumstance, that no one in the flight would think of the valley of Jehoshaphat, so long as it was enclosed by mountains. The

lengthening of the valley gives accordingly the reason for fleeing into it. — The mountain valley of the Lord, the valley of Jehoshaphat, (comp. p. 65 sq.), not merely the valley between the two halves of the Mount of Olives, which here comes under consideration only as a lengthening of the valley of Jehoshaphat. We shall not dwell on the false punctuation וְנַסְתֶּם, instead of וְנַסְתֶּם, which is found in several manuscripts, and from which the translation of the Chaldee, *et obturabitur*, and that of the Seventy, and of *Symm.*, *καὶ ἐμφραχθήσεται φάραγξ ὀρέων μου*, originated. It gives no intelligible sense, and affords no explanation of the following כִּי. — "*For the mountain valley will reach to Azal.*" אָצַל is here taken by the older interpreters as a proper name, with the exception of Symmachus and Jerome, who render it by *proximus*. Cyril remarks: *Κώμη δὲ αὕτη πρὸς ἐσχατιαῖς, ὥς λόγος τοῦ ὄρους κειμένη.* Nearly all interpreters, however, who understand אָצַל also as a proper name, have seen that it must not here be taken as a naked geographical designation, but with reference to its appellative import, as is manifest from the whole nature of the description. In the determination of this meaning, however, they differ widely from each other. This would not be the case, if the passage Mic. 1 : 11 had been more attentively considered. In a description, where several proper names are placed with constant allusion to their appellative meaning, the prophet, while describing how the divine judgment constantly advances from city to city, until it has reached Jerusalem, says: "The lamentation of Beth Haezel will deprive you of its *standing still* (will not continue to you the ceasing of the lamentation, as might be expected from the etymology of the name of the city). For also (the more distant) Maroth shall experience pain. For evil comes down from the Lord upon Jerusalem." According to this passage, Beth Haezel must be a city not far from Jerusalem, and signify the house of standing still, a meaning easily derived from the usual one of the verb אָצַל, *to lay by the side*, while that assumed by Gesenius, *Thes.* s. v. בית, *domus radicis firmæ*, has nothing in its favor in the Hebrew idiom, since even אָצִיל, *nobilis*, is not to be explained with him, *radicatus*, but, as a comparison of the proper name Azaliah shows, by *sepositus*. If now we look at the form of the proper name in the passage, it is evident that אָצַל, in *pausa* אָצָל, can signify only *standing still, ceasing;* comp. Ewald, p. 231. The valley therefore shall reach to a place, which actually affords to the fugitives, what its name promises, the cessation of the danger, because when they have attained it, they are

beyond the reach of the divine judgments. Whether this place is the same as that mentioned by Micah, can neither be denied, since the Beth in proper names is frequently omitted (comp. Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 193,) and similar variations in their form, as Ezel and Azal, elsewhere often occur; nor with certainty affirmed, because the situation of the place in both passages is left indefinite, only that, according to Zechariah, it must have been eastward of Jerusalem beyond the Mount of Olives. — "*And ye flee,*" viz., from fear of being swallowed up with the enemies of God by the earth, which opens during the earthquake; comp. Num. 16 : 34: "And all Israel round about them fled, for they said, lest the earth swallow us up." — The earthquake in the time of King Uzziah is not mentioned in the historical books, but only Amos 1 : 1. The way in which he speaks of it, *in the days*, as well as the subjoined, *of the kings of Judah*, to prevent any one from regarding Uzziah as a king of Israel, shows that the prophet lived at a time far distant from the event compared. True, Hitzig supposes, l. c., that all can be fully explained from the diffuse style of the writer, but he has not been able to bring forward a single example in point. — "*And there comes the Lord my God, all holy ones with thee.*" The prophet here speaks of another coming of the Lord, than that described in v. 3, for the judgment of his enemies. After the Lord has delivered his people, he comes in order to dwell with them on the glorified earth. The prophet is so ravished with this delightful prospect, that for a time he entirely loses sight of the enemies, and afterwards resumes his description of their punishment. *My* God is explained by the circumstance that the prophet, while he sees the Lord draw near in the most glorious manifestation of his grace, is seized with lively joy, because this God is *his* God. The *suff.* in עִמָּךְ is not, with several Jewish interpreters and Drusius, to be referred to Jerusalem, for this simple reason, besides several others, because then it would be *fem.*, but to the Lord, to whom the prophet, beholding him in inward vision as already present, no longer satisfied to speak of him in the third person, directs his address with triumphant emotions and exulting rapture, that the long Absent and Desired has at length arrived. — By קְדוֹשִׁים many interpreters understand the angels; others, as Mark, the saints, the church of God on earth; others, as Vitringa on Apoc. 15 : 3, both, *sancti tam angeli, quam homines.* The decision is difficult; the first interpretation is favored by, "He comes with ten thousand of saints," the angels, Deut. 33 : 2, and still more by, "All

his saints are in thy hand," (v. 3,) "they stand prepared for thy service, serve thy prosperity, O Israel;" and also Matt. 25 : 31 : *ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ.* Mark 8 : 38 : *ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων.* Apoc. 19 : 14.

V. 6. "*And it comes to pass in that day, it will be not light, that which is precious will become mean.*" The prophet here describes the transition from the deepest darkness which attends the judgment upon the enemies of the divine kingdom and the birth of the new world, to the most splendid light, which irradiates the new-formed world; first, entire darkness, in the verse before us, then a mixture of light and darkness, and lastly, pure light, v. 7, analogous to the first creation, where at first darkness covered the chaos, then, by the matter of light created on the first day, a twilight arose, until, after the matter of light was concentrated in the heavenly bodies created on the third day, the brightness became perfect. — In the second member there is a diversity of readings. The Kethib is to be pointed יִקָּפְאוּן, as the *fut.* of קָפָא; the marginal reading is וְקִפָּאוֹן. As to the latter, it is by most interpreters after the Seventy, (*καὶ ψύχος καὶ πάγος,*) explained by *cold and frost;* "there will be no light, (but there will be) cold and frost." They take either יְקָרוֹת as synonymous with קָרוֹת, *frigora*, appealing to the fact, that Prov. 17 : 27 has, for וְקַר רוּחַ of the text, the marginal reading יְקַר רוּחַ in the same sense; or they assert that instead of יְקָרוֹת must be read וְקָרוֹת. But this whole interpretation has every thing against it, and it is therefore extremely wonderful, how it could have gained the approbation of by far the greater part of interpreters. That a word of such frequent occurrence as יְקָר should here stand, for once, in an entirely new meaning is highly improbable; the marginal reading Prov. 17 : 27, as a proof, is nothing more nor less, than a Jewish conjecture *à la Houbigant*, as is indeed the case with most of the marginal readings; the mutation of יְקָרוֹת into וְקָרוֹת must be regarded as arbitrary, so long as an entire impossibility of explaining the reading of the text cannot be shown; the alleged noun קִפָּאוֹן nowhere occurs, and, even assuming its existence, the meaning, for which the language has other words, would still not be established; the construction, the supplying of יִהְיֶה, without the negation, is hard. But what is of chief importance, nothing is said of *cold* and *frost* in all the parallel passages of the prophet. They are by no means suitable in this description, in which the discourse throughout is only of *light* and

darkness (comp. v. 7,) so that the second member also, like the first, must contain a description of darkness. And what external authority then has this interpretation, which is liable to such numerous difficulties, in its favor? As good as none; for as the marginal reading very frequently, indeed almost uniformly, even where at first view it commends itself, has arisen from mere conjecture; as the obscurity of the passage, as is shown by the favor which interpreters have given to the marginal reading, must have been a temptation to such a conjecture; as the difference of the *gender* between the *noun* and the *verb* in the text seemed to be a justification of it, how can the marginal reading here be entitled to any further importance, than that of a Jewish conjecture, whose first origin is perhaps to be sought in the version of the Seventy, who endeavoured to guess what they could not understand? Let us now turn to the different explanations of the text. Ch. B. Michaelis explains, "Claritates *enim, si quæ per vices existent*, condensabuntur, *atque in spissas mox tenebras transibunt.*" This interpretation is to be rejected, if it were only on the ground, that it takes יְקָרוֹת in a sense entirely unauthorized. יָקָר never signifies any thing else than *precious, glorious*, never *shining*, as has been erroneously inferred from Job 31: 26, much less *claritates.* יְקָרוֹת, therefore, can signify nothing but *costly things.* Far better grounded is the interpretation of the acute De Dieu, *Crit. Sacr.* p. 305: "*Non erit lux; prctiosa concrescent. Pretiosa vocat cœlum, solem, lunam, cæteras stellas, aërem, terram, aquam, quæ vere sunt pretiosissima mundi. Hæc concrescent in consummatione seculi, quum στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα λυθήσονται,* et *οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται*, (2 Pet. 3: 10, 12;) *illa soluta inter se coibunt et veluti in massam unam coalescent. — Hinc sequitur, lucem nullam fore, quia, quæ lucem præbent, aliis erunt involuta.*" This interpretation is nevertheless liable to the objection, that the thought which it attributes to the passage is foreign to the Old Testament parallel passages, which are so important, particularly of Zechariah. They speak, when they either, like Zechariah, describe the last great judgment, or when, in the description of inferior judgments, they borrow their images from that, always of the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars, never of a darkness, which would arise from the conversion of all created things into a new chaos. And this thought is with them so uniform, so predominant, that we must have greatly wondered, if we had not found it here. Comp. Joel 2: 10: "Before him the earth trembles, the heavens quake, the sun and the moon mourn, the stars

withdraw their splendor." In like manner 4 : 4, 3 : 4, "The sun will be changed into darkness and the moon to blood." Ezek. 32 : 7: "And I cover the heavens, and make the stars to mourn, I will conceal the sun with a cloud, and the moon will not give her light." V. 8: "All the lights in heaven will I cause to mourn for thee, and I give darkness over thy land." Is. 13 : 10 : "For the stars of heaven and their constellations will not give their light. The sun is dark in its going forth, and the moon causes its brightness not to shine." Amos 8 : 19. — In accordance with these passages, we understand by יְקָרוֹת, *precious things*, as a designation of the luminous bodies of heaven, and with the more reason, since Job l. c. the moon is designated as precious, as walking magnificently, יְקַר הֹלֵךְ, and translate, "costly things become vile, the heavenly bodies will lose their most beautiful ornament, the light." The ground meaning of the verb קָפָא is that of *contraction*. Hence arises, first, that of *coagulation*, secondly, that of *diminution* or *deterioration*. In the Arab. قَفَّ, *contracta, corrugata fuit res*. In the Talmud קפא (comp. Buxtorf, c. 2084.), *allevare, leve reddere*, קְפוּי, *leve, vile, vilis pretii*, in the gloss of the Talmud explained by קל. In the sense of *contraction, diminution*, the verb also occurs Exod. 15 : 8. By the explanation, which has been given, the difficulty also of the apparent disagreement in gender is removed. It is a simple *Constructio ad sensum*, as *sun, moon*, and *stars* are masculine. There is therefore no occasion to appeal to the extremely few instances where, as Is. 49 : 11, an *enallage of gender* occurs, for which no reason can be given.

V. 7. "*And it will be: one day, it will be known to the Lord, neither day, nor night, and at the time of even it will become light.*" That the first words must be thus construed, appears from the way in which וְהָיָה is used in the first and second member, and in general throughout this whole prophecy; so that we cannot with most interpreters translate precisely, *erit dies unus*, but must rather supply יִהְיֶה after יוֹם or, more correctly, deduce it from וְהָיָה. אֶחָד *one*, here, according to most interpreters, signifies *singular, excellent*. So Ch. B. Michaelis; "*Prorsus singularis, et qui parem vix habiturus est, idque ratione ingruentis tum caliginis et calamitatis, tum lucis et auxilii divini.*" But this meaning is here as little suitable, as it is in general proved to be. It is found indeed in the Arabic, but not in the Hebrew idiom, for the only passage, which is here cited in favor of it, Ezek. 7 : 5, is to be translated, "Behold a wicked evil

comes." The correct view was seen by Cocceius; "*Unus dies, tempus non longum.*" As a designation of the comparatively shortest portion of time, we meet with *one day* already, chap. 3, 9; and, as a designation of a comparatively short period, *one month*, chap. 11: 8. The times, in relation to which that of the mingling of darkness and light is designated as very short, are those of the perfect darkness and perfect light. The phrase "it will be known," or "it is known," does not relate like similar expressions, Matt. 24: 36, Mark 13: 32, only to the time of the appearing of this day, but rather chiefly to its nature. Correctly Burk; "*Solus dominus plene planeque sciet, quæ ejus diei sit ratio.*" The phrase "not day and not night," Mark explains better than he is aware of, since he hesitates between this and several other untenable interpretations; "*Ut ob mixturam quandam lucis diei et tenebrarum noctis, nec illius, nec hujus nomen conveniat isti tempori, sed sit instar diluculi aut crepusculi cujusdam.*" The phrase, "in the evening it will become light," is explained by the antithesis Amos 8: 9: "And in that day, saith the Lord, I cause the sun to go down at mid-day, and bring darkness over the earth in the day of light." As it becomes dark there, where the clearest light was possessed and expected, so it here becomes light at the time when only darkness is expected, where a day of mixed darkness and light comes to an end, and now, according to the natural course of things, the entirely dark night appears to succeed.

V. 8. "*And it happens in that day, living waters will go forth from Jerusalem, their half to the east sea, and their half to the west sea, in the summer and in the winter will it be.*" The east and west sea, the Dead and the Mediterranean, stand here only as the *termini ad quem* of the course of the living waters, otherwise than in Ezekiel chap. 47, where the sea is improved by these waters. By the choice of this *terminus*, the prophet indicates that the water would pass through the whole promised land, which was bounded on the east by the Dead, and on the west by the Mediterranean Sea. To what purpose, is shown by the parallel passage Joel 4: 18; "And it shall come to pass at that time that the mountains will drop with must, and the hills will flow with milk, and all the brooks of Judah will flow with water, and a fountain goes forth from the house of the Lord and waters the valley of Shittim." However the valley of Shittim may be defined, so much is certain, that it is a dry, unfruitful place, the destination of the water, therefore, to render fruitful the

land, sterile for want of water, and at the same time always to supply the thirsty with a refreshing drink, as is also announced in the foregoing prediction of abundance instead of want, and fruitfulness instead of sterility, is confirmed. If now we inquire after the sense of this representation, no one surely will agree with the explanation of Grotius, "*aquæ ductus fient egregii, ut in alta pace,*" which is entirely characteristic of the exegetical manner of its author, which nevertheless is not surpassed by other strange things, which he brings forward upon the chapter, when, e. g., he understands by him who appears on the Mount of Olives the son of Bacchus, who from there orders the siege, and concerning the cleaving of the mountain remarks, "*Multa humus egeretur, ita ut hiet mons in magna sui parte,*" &c. If then the representation is figurative, the question arises, What does the figure import? Here, however, there can be no doubt. The water, as well that which descends from the clouds, as that of fountains, brooks, and streams, where the comparison is not expressly limited to something special, is always an image of the divine blessings in their whole compass, and in all their fulness, which quicken the dry and thirsty waste of man's necessity. This will be evident from a citation of several of the principal passages; the departure of God, the withdrawal of his favors and blessings, appear as a destitution of water, e. g. Is. 41 : 17 : "The suffering and poor seek for water, and it is not there, their tongue faileth for thirst; I, the Lord, will hear them; I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them." Still more to the purpose are such passages as Is. 44 : 3 : "I will pour water upon that which is thirsty, and streams upon that which is dry; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." "My blessing" is here the whole of the substance of the figure; "my Spirit" is a part of the same, and we must not, in order to make both expressions entirely synonymous, either with some interpreters attribute a false meaning to רוּחַ, or with others, limit בְּרָכָה, 41 : 18; "I open upon the hills streams, in the valleys fountains, and make the desert pools of water, and the dry land springs of water. I will give in the wilderness cedars," &c. 30 : 25; "And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, streams of water in the day of the great battle, when the towers fall." Ezek. 34 : 26; "I give them and the environs of my hill for a blessing, and cause the rain to come down in its time," comp. yet Is. 43 : 20, 44 : 8, 48 : 21, 49 : 10, 58 : 11. It may be still further asked, why the prophet causes the water, the image of the divine

blessings, to go forth from Jerusalem. The answer is, that, under the image of the central point of the militant church under the Old Testament, of the place which the Lord glorified by his typical presence in the temple, is here exhibited to the prophet the central point of the triumphant church, the place where the Lord, when he comes with his saints, establishes his residence; comp. v. 6, 2: 15; his *rest*, Is. 11: 10. From Jerusalem, therefore, go forth the waters, in so far as here is the seat of the Lord, the place from which he imparts his gracious favors to his subjects. This appears still clearer from the comparison of the parallel passages. According to Joel and Ezekiel, the water goes forth from the temple; according to Apoc. 22: 1, from the throne of God and the Lamb. — If now Jerusalem stands here as a designation of its antitype, so must accordingly the whole compass of the Jewish land, over which the fountain pours itself, signify that which bears the same relation to the glorified Jerusalem, as this bears to the typical, i. e. the whole compass of the glorified kingdom of God, which indeed, according to v. 9, and the constant predictions of all other prophets, is to be extended over the whole earth. The whole earth therefore shall be watered with the stream of the divine blessings, Ps. 36: 6. — The last words, "in summer and in winter it will be," signify the permanency of the divine blessings, in contrast, partly with the frailty of all human enjoyments, partly with the frequent interruptions of these divine gifts themselves, during the time of the militant church, when the Lord must often conceal his face in order to cleanse the church, in which were mingled the holy and profane, by purifying judgments; while now, when the whole church consists of the righteous, and there is no more a Canaanite in the house of the Lord, there will be no more curse. Jerome explains, "*Ut nec gelu constringantur hyeme, nec æstatis nimio fervore siccentur?*" But the comparison of the parallel passages shows, that the prophet here had only the last in view; that the winter is named as the time, when even other brooks give forth abundance of water. (Job 6: 16—18,) compares his friends with brooks, which are swollen in the winter, and have an abundance of water, but in summer, when their water is most needed, dry up, and therefore painfully deceive the hope of the traveller. Isaiah (58: 11) represents the divine mercy, and those who were its objects, under the image of a fountain whose waters do *not lie*.

V. 9. "*And the Lord will be king over the whole land; in that day the Lord will be only one and his name only one.*" עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ is

very generally translated "over the whole earth." There can be no doubt that this interpretation is substantially correct, that here the discourse is concerning an extension of the dominion of the Lord over all nations of the earth in contrast with its former limitation to a single people; comp. chap. 9: 9, 10. Ps. 72: 8 — 11. Ps. 2. Dan. 2: 35, &c. We must however with Rückert prefer the translation "over the whole land." For, v. 8, the new kingdom of God had represented itself to the prophet under the image of the former; v. 10, we find the same mode of representation, and it is certainly unnatural to assume, that כָּל־הָאָרֶץ stands here in a sense different from there, so immediately after. Mark correctly observes: "*Non agitur heic de regno naturæ et providentiæ communis; — sed de regno speciali gratiæ, — quale habuit deus olim in Israel.*" The Lord is the natural king of the whole human race; but this relation was disturbed by the fall; this was the commencement of a series of rebellious efforts, which terminated in nearly all his subjects withdrawing their allegiance from him, and choosing for themselves other lords and kings in heaven and on earth, according to their hearts' desire. The Lord, for whom it would have been easy to destroy his unfaithful subjects by a word of his omnipotence, willed, in accordance with his love, instead of this, their voluntary return to obedience. Because the whole mass was not yet prepared, he commenced by restoring the natural relation among one particular people. With the first appearing of Christ commenced the extension of the plan to which the special Theocracy had served only as the means; its completion will be introduced with his return in glory, when all opposers will either by his mercy be converted from his enemies to his servants, or be destroyed by his punishment from his kingdom, which will then embrace the whole earth. Especially remarkable in this connexion is Ps. 22: 28, 29; "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to the Lord; all nations of the heathen shall fall down before thee. For to the Lord is the dominion, he ruleth among the heathen." That all the heathen will hereafter be subject to the Lord is grounded on the fact, that he is their rightful and natural king and their present relation to him, an unnatural one, which therefore cannot be lasting. "The Lord will be one, and his name one," is well explained by a Lapide: "*Jam in orbe multi habentur et nominantur dii, — sed tempore illo unus ab omnibus gentibus coletur et nominabitur deus.*" "The Lord will be only one," is illustrated by the Arabic, where idolaters bear the standing name

المشركون, *qui deo socios addunt.* "His name," &c. has been variously misunderstood. It is explained by the circumstance, that all names of idols, because though these אֱלִילִים are nonentities, yet as the heathen choose to designate God by them, may be considered in a certain sense as different appellations of the true God. It is entirely analogous, when, in the second part of Isaiah, the efforts of the makers of idols are constantly represented as attempts to represent God by an image, and on this ground their folly is shown. It may be supposed, that the prophet was here led by the events of his time to give prominence to the fact, that at that time the name of the Lord would be only one. The edicts of the Persian kings, as contained in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, make it highly probable, that the Persians, who are greatly addicted to religious amalgamation, were prepared to represent their God Ormuzd and the God of Israel as one and the same Deity, differing only in names and modes of revelation, without going any farther, because they naturally thought that every people must preserve their own name of God, and hold fast to the mode of revelation vouchsafed to them, which cannot indeed be separated from the name.

V. 10. "*All the land will change, as the plain from Gebah to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem; and she will be exalted, and seat herself on her throne, from the gate of Benjamin, to the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel to the wine presses of the king.*" The object in the verse is twofold. First, the exaltation of Jerusalem, effected by all the rest of the land being changed into a plain; then, her restoration to her former greatness, after having been destroyed by being taken by the enemy, v. 2, still more however perhaps by the earthquake, v. 5, and the other judgments inflicted upon the enemies found in her. — We first explain that which relates to the former object. The verb סָבַב here *to turn one's self, to change one's self.* כָּל־הָאָרֶץ, not indeed, as Michaelis, "the whole region round about Jerusalem," but "the whole land." This appears from precisely the only thing which could establish this limitation, the phrase *from Geba to Rimmon.* For these are the two extreme boundaries of the land of Judea on the south and the north, by which the prophet here designates its whole compass, in like manner as in v. 8, by its east and west boundaries. Rimmon, here designated as south of Jerusalem, to distinguish it from the rock Rimmon, lay in the extreme south of the tribe of Judah, and, like Beersheba, was a city of the Simeonites on the borders of Idumea; comp.

Josh. 15 : 21, 32. That Gebah lay on the north border, appears from the fact that, 2 Kings 23 : 8, the whole extent of the kingdom of Judah is designated by the expression, "from Gebah to Beersheba," comp. Reland, II. p. 801, 973, Bachiene, II. § 369, 257. כָּעֲרָבָה stands instead of a whole proposition, "as the plain is, or, is conditioned." Just as כְּ, chap. 2 : 10 : "I spread you out רוּחוֹת כְּאַרְבַּע, as are the four winds, so that your dwelling-place corresponds with them." The interpreters uniformly take הָעֲרָבָה as an appellative, *a plain*, without considering that we have then no appropriate sense, as the land to be changed into the plain, cannot be compared with a plain, and that the article, which points to a definite plain, is opposed to this interpretation. עֲרָבָה, with the article, always signifies the greatest and principal of all the plains of Judea, that of the Jordan, "the low land between the mountain ranges, which encompass the Jordan on the east and west side," in Josephus, *μέγα πεδίον*, comp. Reland, I. p. 359 sq.; Bachiene, I. § 154 sq.; Ritter, II. p. 321. — The sense therefore is, "All mountains in Judea, those of Jerusalem excepted, shall be changed into plains, so that the whole land is like the great flat, which hitherto constituted only one portion of it." The design of the change is intimated by, "and Jerusalem will be exalted." The whole land will be depressed, in order that Jerusalem alone may appear elevated. We now investigate the import of this symbolical representation. Jerusalem here again designates, as in v. 8, the central point of the glorified kingdom of God, Judea, this kingdom in its whole compass, in its extension over the whole earth. How then could the sense well be otherwise, than that "the Lord alone will be exalted in that day, his rest glorious, (Is. 11 : 10), his dominion, as that of the king of the whole earth, will destroy all earthly and apparent greatness, which rises up in opposition." By a somewhat different image, thereby showing that the crude literal understanding found in Jewish interpreters is entirely untenable, the same thought is expressed in Is. 2 : 2, Mic. 4 : 1, Ezek. 40 : 2. The temple mountain will be placed on the summit of all the mountains of the earth. A third image is found in Dan. 2 : 35. The stone, the symbol of the Messiah's kingdom, smites the colossus which represents the kingdoms of the world in contrast with that of God, and becomes a mountain, which fills the whole earth. — We now proceed to explain what concerns the second object, the rebuilding of the city. Concerning יִשְׁבָה תַחְתֶּיהָ, see on chap. 12 : 6. The לְ in לְמִשְׁעָר, is to be joined with the verb יָשַׁב. The verb יָשַׁב is not seldom con-

strued with לְ, when it imports not *to dwell*, or *to sit*, but *to seat one's self;* comp. e. g. Ps. 9 : 5. We cannot therefore interpret "she *sits*," as all interpreters do, but "she *seats herself* on her throne, in the place of the gate of Benjamin," &c. The whole compass of the city is the seat or throne, which she takes possession of. Here she seats herself on her throne, v. 11, where יָשַׁב with בְּ is construed "she *sits*" thereon. The point, from which this determination of the boundaries proceeds, is the gate of Benjamin. This gate is no doubt the same, which is elsewhere called "the gate of Ephraim." The way to the land of Benjamin was by the gate of Benjamin, comp. Jer. 37 : 12, 13. It lay therefore northward. The gate of Ephraim is designated 2 Sam. 13 : 23, as directed towards Ephraim, עִם אֶפְרַיִם; the way towards Ephraim however passed through Benjamin, comp. Faber, *Archäol.* p. 334. The first *terminus ad quem* is the *place of the first gate*. This gate does not occur besides under the same name, it is however no doubt the same, which elsewhere bears the name שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה. This appears first from the name. שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה means "the gate of the old," not precisely "the old gate." After Gousset, Hitzig, l. c. p. 53, supposes "gate of the old" to be, e. g. "gate of the old pool," which is mentioned Is. 22 : 11. But this opinion is entirely untenable, because the שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה lay in the northeast corner of the city, where the old pool, formed by the waters of the fountain Siloa, could not possibly be; comp. Vitringa, and Ges. *on Is.* l. c. Besides, the ellipsis is harsh, and without example. This difficulty on the contrary is removed, as soon as with others we explain, "gate of the old city." For as the cities were personified as matrons, every addition was properly unnecessary. We often find, besides, also *Jescanah* as a name of two cities; comp. Reland, p. 861. By the name of the old city, however, was that part of Jerusalem probably designated, which already existed at the time of the Jebusites, in contrast with the later enlargement by David and his successors, — in like manner as, at a later period, that which was recently built was called *Bezetha*, *καινὴ πόλις* in Josephus, in contrast with the whole of the former city. Faber, p. 277. The name of this gate entirely corresponded with this. שַׁעַר הָרִאשׁוֹן can mean nothing else than "the first gate," not, as Hitzig supposes, "the former, or, the gate that was;" for this meaning would then only be proper, when there was an antithesis with a new gate. רִאשׁוֹן never signifies "that which was," without this contrast with the present. As now the old city was the first, so also was its gate, among all the gates of the later Jerusalem, the first. In favor

of this we have, secondly, its position; just as here the *first* gate appears as the first *terminus ad quem* from the gate of Benjamin, in Neh. 12: 39, where the gates are numbered according to their geographical position, the old gate follows immediately after the gate of Ephraim. We must not seek the first gate west of the gate of Benjamin, but east. For, as the *terminus ad quem* from the gate of Benjamin towards the west, the corner gate is immediately mentioned; and that we must by no means seek the first between this and the gate of Benjamin is evident from the very small distance, four hundred cubits, by which, according to 2 Kings 14: 23, both gates were separated from each other. Entirely corresponding with this is the position of the gate of the old city. It was nearest to the gate of Ephraim towards the east, probably at the northeast extremity, comp. Faber, p. 332. — עַד before שַׁעַר הַפִּנִּים designates not the *terminus ad quem* from the first gate, but, as already remarked, a new *terminus ad quem* from the gate of Benjamin westward. For that the corner gate lay not eastward, but westward, appears from Jer. 31: 38, where, by the antithesis of the tower of Hananeel lying on the east side, and of the corner gate, the whole breadth of the city is designated. — The tower of Hananeel lay on the east side of the city near to the sheep gate, Neh. 3: 1, 12: 37, 39. From this tower, the prophet begins a new line, — for before מִגְדָּל מִן is to be supplied out of the preceding, — which he continues to the wine-vats of the king, without doubt on the south side of the city, where, according to Neh. 3: 15, were the royal gardens; comp. Faber, p. 335. Thus therefore we have here a description of the compass of the city according to all the four regions of heaven. And now a highly remarkable phenomenon presents itself, which alone is sufficient to prove the genuineness of the second part. The prophet mentions only the edifices, which had remained uninjured in the destruction by the Chaldeans, none which were not in existence in the time of Zechariah after the destruction, and before the rebuilding of the walls by Nehemiah. In the first place, two gates, the gate of Benjamin, and the corner gate, serve as *termini;* for the third, the first gate by the addition *unto the place,* unto its former site, is expressly designated as no longer existing. One of these, the corner gate, appears also in the prophecy of Jer. 31: 38, composed after the destruction, as still standing, (comp. Bertholdt, p. 1436.) Both were omitted in the description of the rebuilding of the gates by Nehemiah, chap. 3, which, especially when compared with 12: 39, cannot be explained other-

wise, than by supposing that it did not need to be rebuilt, but only perhaps slightly repaired. On the contrary, the old gate, appearing here as destroyed, is mentioned among those which were rebuilt. The tower of Hananeel appears, as well in Jer. l. c., as also Neh. 3 : 1, as still standing. — The royal wine-vats cannot easily be supposed to have been destroyed. This was scarcely possible, since, as is still the case in the east (comp. Chardin, in Harmar, Th. III. p. 117.), where the ground allows it, they are hewn out of the rocks ; comp. Is. 5 : 2, Matt. 21 : 33. *Nonni Dionysiac.* 12, 330. Such being the nature of the royal wine-vats, it is as probable as the contrary, that they still exist among the great mass of the excavations in the rocks, which are found particularly in the neighbourhood of the fountain of Siloa ; comp. Ritter, II. p. 419, 421. For why should they not as well be preserved as the cisterns and graves ? Their destruction, properly speaking, was impossible, though they might have been filled up. We can however abundantly prove by a special witness, that they were still in existence. They lay, as already remarked, without doubt in the royal gardens, and these appear, Neh. 3 : 15, to have been spared during the destruction by the Chaldeans. — We now inquire, what the prophet intends to express by the image of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. For that we are not to take him literally, is evident from the whole character of the description, particularly v. 8, 9, where, under the image of Judea, the whole earth presents itself, and in like manner the first half of the verse before us, where Jerusalem, in relation to the rest of Judea, designates the central point of the future kingdom of God, in relation to its circumference, which embraces the whole earth. The rebuilding of Jerusalem here predicted, stands in close relation to its capture described v. 1, 2, and the desolations occasioned by the divine judgments inflicted upon the enemies found in it. The sense, the kingdom of God after the Lord shall have removed all traces of the calamity, to which it had been subject, will recover its ancient splendor. This the prophet expresses, in accordance with the representation of the distresses inflicted upon the same, under the image of a capture of the city, by the image of its restoration to its *ancient* limits, which are accordingly more accurately defined by a special mention of the particular bounds.

V. 11. "*And they dwell in her, and there shall be no more curse, and Jerusalem sits securely on her throne.*" After "they dwell therein," there is no occasion, with most interpreters, to supply a *scil.* "se-

curely." For then would the last member contain an empty tautology. Rather, the bare sitting or dwelling, is here sufficient, in the antithesis with, "she seated herself," in the preceding verse; and at the same time with the going forth, partly as prisoners, partly as fugitives, v. 2, and v. 5. The expression, "there shall be no more curse," designates the church of God as consisting, after this catastrophe, purely of the righteous and holy, and therefore no longer, as in former times, to be purified by Theocratical judgments; comp. on v. 21. In the new Jerusalem the penal justice of God will no more find an object; his whole conduct towards her therefore will be an uninterrupted manifestation of his love and mercy. The same thought Jeremiah l. c. expresses by including the valley of Hinnom, a place desecrated by the most frightful abominations, within the compass of the new Jerusalem, and then subjoining, "they shall no more be destroyed for ever;" comp. also Apoc. 22 : 3.

V. 12. "*And this will be the plague wherewith the Lord will plague all nations, which have warred against Jerusalem; his flesh will rot while he stands on his feet, and his eyes will rot in their sockets and their tongue will rot in their mouth.*" The prophet, having first described the judgments upon the house of God, contented himself with a mere intimation of the destruction, which the Lord would bring upon its enemies, the instruments, and no less the objects, of his penal justice, v. 3 — 5, and had proceeded directly to an object most attractive to his heart, to the blessings to be conferred by the mercy of God upon his purified church. Here he interrupts the description, in order more fully to describe the punishment of the enemies. According to the nature of the prophetico-symbolic representation, which exhibits every thing in vision, and at the same time with reference to the corporeal judgments under the former Theocracy, as e. g. that upon the Assyrians, the punishment here appears exclusively as corporeal, in like manner as the crime also is made an object of sense, by being represented under the form of a military expedition against Jerusalem. Not perceiving this, Cocceius and Mark would transfer the spiritual element of the punishment into the words themselves. They suppose that the prophet speaks of a wasting away of the body arising from remorse of conscience! The correct view is rather, that the substance of the prophet's prediction is merely the punishment itself, that he leaves the mode of this to the fulfilment, and that what he seems to say concerning it, belongs only to the dress, instead of which another could have been chosen, as appears

e. g. from a comparison of Is. 66 : 24, where the enemies of the kingdom of God appear under the image of living corpses, which lie as an everlasting prey of the worms, and the fire without the gate of the residence of the holy, i. e. of Jerusalem. — On the *Infin.* הָרֹג, which gives prominence to the action alone, in order to direct attention to its fearfulness, comp. Ewald, p. 559. The *Hiph.* shows, that we are to regard the agent, as the Lord, and therefore that for this reason the translation of Rückert, with all his effort to be literal, "the disappearing of his flesh, because he stands on his feet," is not correct. It is liable to a still stronger objection. He has been led by the Lexicons and commentators on the passage, to give to the verb נָקַק the meaning to *disappear*, while the meaning to *rot*, to *moulder*, is the only one that can be justified by the use of the verb itself, not merely Ps. 38 : 6, where it is necessarily required, but also Levit. 26 : 39, and in Ezek. 24 : 23, 33 : 10, which rests upon this passage, where it gives, as here, a stronger, and therefore in this connexion a preferable sense ; and also by the use of the derivative, מַק, *rottenness, mould*, Is. 3 : 24, 5 : 24. The expression, "and he stands upon his feet," magnifies the fearfulness of the judgment. They will be living corpses. If we look at that which is corporeal alone, such a putrefaction of a living body is far more terrifying than death. Cyril, *ὁ μὲν γὰρ κοινὸς οὗτος καὶ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως θάνατος τήκει μὲν τὰς ἁπάντων σάρκας, καὶ ἀποκείρει ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ γλώσσας, πάνδεινον δὲ καὶ τῆς εἰς λῆξιν ἡκούσης συμφορᾶς εἴη ἂν εἰκότως τὸ ζώντων καὶ ἑστώτων ἔτι τακῆναι μὲν σάρκας καὶ ἀπορρεῖν ὀφθαλμούς, κολάζεσθαι δὲ καὶ γλώσσας.* That besides the flesh, the eye and tongue are especially mentioned, is not, as the comparison of chap. 11 : 16 shows, without reason. The tongue is mentioned, because it insolently contemned God and his people, (Jerome : *lingua magniloqua, quæ dei populum blasphemabat, solvetur in saniem, et intra vallum dentium computrescet,*) comp. Ps. 12 : 4, Is. chap. 37 ; the eye, because it spied out the nakedness of the city of God ; the whole body, because it invaded Jerusalem.

V. 13. "*And it happens in that day, great will be the confusion caused by the Lord among them, and they seize each one the hand of his neighbour, and his hand raises itself up against the hand of his neighbour.*" There is here an allusion to the example of panic-terror, sent by the Lord upon his enemies, and a confusion, which led to mutual destruction in the former history of the people of God, comp. Deut. 7 : 23, Judges 7 : 14, 1 Sam. 14 : 20 ("and be-

hold the sword of a man was against his neighbour, a very great confusion," מְהוּמָה); principally however to the history of Jehoshaphat; comp. particularly 2 Chron. 20 : 23 : "And the children of Ammon and Moab stood up against the inhabitants of mount Seir, utterly to slay and destroy them; and when they had made an end of the inhabitants of Seir, they helped to destroy one another." Comp. also Is. 49 : 26. Ezek. 38 : 21, "The sword of a man shall be against his brother," where there is a similar allusion. רֵעַ stands here emphatic. It is a certain sign of the curse of God when allies rage against one another; comp. chap. 11 : 14, Is. 19 : 2. — By the seizing of the hand, we are to understand a hostile assault, according to the connexion and the parallel passages. Still more plainly is hostility implied in "the hand raises itself," &c. Each one seeks to master the hand of his neighbour in order in this way to disarm him, and having done this, he cuts at him, and indeed chiefly at his hand, because whoever is deprived of it, can be slain without danger.

V. 14. "*And Judah also will fight in Jerusalem, and the riches of all the heathen round about are collected, gold and silver and garments in great abundance.*" According to a very ancient and widely extended interpretation, the first member is translated, "And Judah also will make war with Jerusalem." So the Chaldee, "*Qui sunt de domo Judah, gentes adducent coactas pugnare;*" Jerome, "*Sed et Judas pugnabit adversus Jerusalem;*" Jarchi, Cocceius, Ch. B. Michaelis, Rückert, and many others. At least equally old, (the Seventy, *παραταξεται ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ,*) is the translation, "Judah will combat in Jerusalem." What is adduced in favor of the former interpretation with great plausibility is, the assertion, that בְּ after the verb הִלָּחֵם, uniformly indicates the object of the hostility. But, on a nearer investigation, it appears, that בְּ has this meaning only when the discourse is of persons; that on the contrary, when cities are spoken of, it always and without exception is used to denote place, and accordingly can here be grammatically translated only, "Judah will fight in Jerusalem." This difference between persons and places is grounded in the nature of the case. בְּ after the verb *to fight*, cannot mean precisely *against*, it retains rather its original local meaning. Now a host may well fight in a host, in so far as both come to blows, but not the besieger in the besieged city, until he has captured it. Passages, in which the local meaning of בְּ before the names of places after the verb נִלְחַם, is entirely obvious, and the common understanding of it by *against*, plainly untenable, are the following; Is.

30 : 32, "And in fierce conflicts will he, the Lord, *contend in her*." Judges 9 : 45, אֲבִימֶלֶךְ נִלְחַם בָּעִיר not "Abimelech fought *against*," but "*in* the city." It is before related, how he surprised the gate, by which the besieged made a sally, and then sent out two divisions of the host against them, which were cut off from the city, while he himself fought in the city. 2 Sam. 11 : 1 ; "David sent Joab and all Israel with him, and they besieged Rabbah." (וַיָּצְרוּ עַל רַבָּה.) Then, 12 : 26; "And then (after all had taken place related in chaps. 11, 12, after an effort had been made in vain, and with great loss, to enter the city,) Joab fought *in* Rabbah, and then took he the kings' city. And Joab sent messengers to David, and said : I have fought *in* Rabbah and taken the city of waters." 2 Sam. 21 : 19, "The war was again בְּנֹב, in Gob;" comp. v. 20. The only doubtful passage is that 1 Sam. 23 : 1, "And they showed to David, behold, the Philistines fight in Kegilah, and plunder the threshing-floors." That the city itself was not taken, is evident from what follows ; yet we are not thereby compelled to give up the local meaning of בְּ. It is only necessary to assume, that the city here includes its nearest environs, in which were the threshing-floors ; comp. Judges 6 : 37, 2 Sam. 24 : 16. If now this argument is done away and indeed proves the opposite, it can no longer be doubted that the explanation, "Judah will fight against Jerusalem," is to be totally rejected. Of a hostile relation between Judah and Jerusalem we find no trace either here, or chap. 12, but rather the opposite. It is however entirely decisive, that here the fighting of Judah stands in manifest connexion with the gathering of the booty in what follows. This connexion, however, cannot exist, unless the fighting is taken, not in a hostile, but in a friendly relation, precisely as, 2 Chron. 20 : 24, &c., both Judah and Jerusalem, as formerly in the danger, so now also participate in the spoil.

V. 15. "*And so will be the plague of the horses, the mules, the camels, and the asses, which shall be in those camps, as this plague.*" The verse contains an amplification of the crime and the punishment. They have so grievously sinned, that their possessions also have become polluted, and subject to the divine malediction. The representation of the prophet here proceeds from the same feeling with the Mosaic ordinance respecting the curse of God. When a whole city had made itself guilty of idolatry, not only were its inhabitants, but also the cattle, to be slain ; so that here, on a small scale, the same relation of the irrational part of the creation to the rational

is repeated, according to which, the creature, on account of the sin of man, was made subject to vanity against its will, comp. Michaelis, *Mos. R.* III. § 145. V. § 246. The case is also analogous, when, for the crime of Achan, besides himself and his children, his oxen, asses, and sheep also, were burnt, Josh. 7 : 24.

V. 16. "*And it comes to pass, all the remnant of all the heathen, which come against Jerusalem, shall go up from year to year to supplicate the King, Jehovah of hosts, and to celebrate the feast of tabernacles.*" — That the journeying of the nations from all the regions of the earth to Jerusalem, is to be understood figuratively, that the prophet, as already, chap. 8 : 22, 23, as Mic. 4 : 1, Is. 2 : 3, employs the method, in which the fear of God, and participation of the kingdom of God, manifested itself under the Old Testament, as a type of its manifestation in the Messianic time, appears partly from the nature of the case itself, ("*qui enim foret possibile, ut omnes universi orbis incolæ, Japanenses, Sinenses, utriusque poli vicini, etc. quotannis Hierosol. peterent festum agitaturi?*" Dachs, *Dissert. ad Sach.* 14, 16. *ad calc. cod. Talmud. Succah*, Ütrecht, 1726. p. 547.,) partly from the nature of the whole description, comp. especially on v. 8 — 10. The question now arises, why the prophet selected from all the festivals, precisely the feast of tabernacles. That he has not done this without a definite reason, appears from the impossibility of otherwise conceiving, why he should not have retained the festivals mentioned in the passage Is. 66 : 23; with which that before us in all respects, even in expression, accurately coincides; "And it comes to pass from new moon to new moon, from Sabbath to Sabbath, all flesh will come to pray before me, saith the Lord." Here, in order to express the zeal of the new citizens of the kingdom of God, in the worship of the Lord, those festivals are chosen, which return most frequently. Under the Old Testament only one people went up to Jerusalem to the three great annual feasts, now all flesh journey thither on each Sabbath and new moon. This parallel passage serves at the same time to place the absurdity of the literal interpretation in a stronger light. In the determination of the ground, which may have induced the prophet to choose precisely the feast of tabernacles, the interpreters are divided. Theodoret (ἐπιτήδειος γὰρ εἰς ἀποδημίας ὁ ταύτης καιρὸς, θέρους ὑπάρχων καιρός), Grotius ("*cum longius positi annuos dies festos celebrare non possint, ut Judæi, certe semel anno, autumni tempore quod ad itinera commodissimum, venient*," etc.), and others, adhere to the least spiritual of all. Nor do those arrive at the truth,

who suppose, that the feast of tabernacles is mentioned only because it was regarded as especially holy by the Jews, which is proved by its being called by Plutarch, Symp. I. IV. 5, *μεγίστην καὶ τελειοτάτην παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἑορτήν*, and the Talmud *κατ᾽ ἐξ.* חג, and because it was celebrated with peculiar joy. There is no ground in the law for distinguishing the feast of tabernacles, in these two respects, above the two remaining festivals, nor can it be shown that this was done in the time of the prophet. The correct view is rather that of those, who, as Dachs, Ch. B. Michaelis, and others, have attributed its selection to the peculiar nature of the feast of tabernacles. It was, according to Levit. 23: 33, a festival of thanksgiving for the merciful protection of the Lord in the journey through the wilderness, to which alone it was owing, that the people, instead of being overcome by the dangers, which threatened their destruction, were purified by them, and attained to the possession of the land of Canaan. This wandering of the people of Israel was however a type (comp. 1 Cor. 10: 11.), not only of the similar proceedings of God with this people in future times, particularly of the Babylonish and present exile, (comp. Ezek. 20: 34; "I bring you to the *wilderness of the nations*, saith the Lord, and there contend with you face to face; as I have contended with your fathers in the wilderness of Egypt, so will I contend with you, saith the Lord. In this wilderness will the Lord purify the people, and cut off the ungodly members; I expel from among you the sinners and the transgressors against me,") but also of his conduct towards those who were destined at a future day to become his people. This people will then celebrate the feast of tabernacles, "*Quum post diuturnas suas per horridum hujus mundi desertum peregrinationes aditum ad hæreditatem, et introitum in Canaam plenarie sibi videbit reclusum in fine dierum;*" (Dachs;) not outwardly, but spiritually, as the Sabbath, Heb. 4: 9, and the passover, 1 Cor. 5: 7, 8. In the feast of tabernacles, as well as in the two remaining great festivals, the benefits of God in nature, were celebrated, together with that manifested in the history of his people. It was at the same time the thanksgiving feast for the completion of the harvest חַג הָאָסִיף. Perhaps the prophet had also this design of the festival in view, perhaps he regarded the feast of tabernacles at the same time as a feast of gratitude for the rich gifts of grace imparted to the new citizens of the kingdom of God. — "All that remains," &c., reminds us, of the coincidence between the type and the antitype. As not all who came up out of Egypt reached Canaan, and there celebrated the feast

of tabernacles, as, on the contrary, the greatest part of them were cut off during the journey through the wilderness, by the divine judgments; so also will not all the heathen, who formerly went up *against* Jerusalem, now go thither in thankfulness and love, but only the remnant whom the mercy of God spares after the greater part, all the stiffnecked despisers of God, shall have been destroyed by the judgments formerly described. — מִן in מִדֵּי is not the *terminus a quo*, nor בְּ in בְּשָׁנָה the *terminus ad quem*, but שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה signifies: *a year in a year*, one year as it were inserted into another, as the links in a chain, and the preceding מִדֵּי, properly *ex sufficientia*, only serves to express more strongly the regularity and constancy of the action. Is., also, 66 : 23, is to be explained, "Regularly every new moon, in *its* new moon, (the one belonging to it, because belonging to the natural course of time immediately following it,) and regularly every Sabbath in its Sabbath." The assertion of several Jewish interpreters is erroneous, that the circumstance, that מֶלֶךְ stands without the article, not לַמֶּלֶךְ, but לְמֶלֶךְ, indicates, that we must translate, "to the king of the Lord," and that by this king, not the Lord himself, but the Messiah is to be understood. The article, which occurs far more rarely in poetry than in prose, comp. Ewald, p. 568, is here not strictly required, because the nearer determination follows, in which case also we could omit it, and entirely the same connexion is found, Is. 6 : 5. The Lord is here also called *king*, not in reference to his general government of the world, but in the Theocratic sense, comp. v. 9.

V. 17. "*And it comes to pass, that whoever of all the families of the earth will not go up to Jerusalem to pray to the king, Jehovah of hosts, — upon them there will be no rain.*" According to several interpreters, by *rain*, here, the divine blessings are figuratively designated. So e. g. Grotius: "*Quod per comparationem dicitur*, Hos. 6 : 3., *id hic per metaphoram, quæ curtata comparatio est, demonstratur; nam per imbrem intelligitur divinus favor, quia et imber vocari solet εὐλογία.*" That which has been already said on v. 12, is applicable here also. To take גֶּשֶׁם, when there is no reason for this in the context, precisely as a figurative designation of the divine blessings, is highly capricious. The correct view is, rather, that the representation of this verse like the former is *throughout* figurative, that the prophet represents spiritual relations by external objects. The thought that, at that time, instead of leaving the heathen to themselves as at present, the Lord would demand of them the fulfilment

of their duties towards him, the prophet expresses, by declaring that all, who do not join in the journey to Jerusalem, should be afflicted with the want of rain; a punishment threatened in the law against its transgressors, and frequently inflicted, particularly in the case of Ahab. It cannot however be inferred from this passage, that at that time there will actually be such refractory persons. The passage is rather entirely analogous to that of Is. 65 : 20. The supposed existence of such, serves the prophet merely as a foundation for the thought, which we have already designated as containing the substance of the representation. The appellation, "the families of the earth," seems to be intentionally chosen, in order to indicate the changed relation of the heathen to the Lord, the Theocratic relation, in which they now stand to him, as it contains the basis of their far stronger obligation henceforth to serve him.

V. 18. "*And if the family of Egypt does not go forth, and come up, so will there not be rain upon them, but there shall be upon them the plague, wherewith the Lord will plague all the nations, who will not go forth to celebrate the feast of tabernacles.*" The strange supposition, that the prophet must here have particular regard to the natural condition of Egypt, which owes its fertility, not to the rain, which there falls sparingly, and in Upper Egypt not at all, but to the Nile, has led the interpreters, almost without exception, to very unnatural interpretations. They either connect וְלֹא עֲלֵיהֶם, as the Seventy have done, with the *protasis*, and then several of them translate, "*super quos non est imber, erit illa plaga, qua affecturus est Jehovah gentes*," by which plague they then understand that of v. 12, but erroneously, because here indeed the discourse relates to the punishment of those, who, after they have escaped the divine judgments, decline going up as suppliants to Jerusalem, — or they explain, beginning the *apodosis* with וְלֹא, "*non erit super ipsos imber ipsorum, s. quod imbris vicem ipsis præstat*," or they understand וְלֹא interrogatively; "*et si familia Ægypti non ascenderit et non venerit, annon erit super eos plaga?*" &c. But the prophet, in naming the Egyptians as an individual example of one people, who should be visited with the punishment of withholding of rain, probably thought but little, whether this special punishment, which is here to be regarded only as an outward exhibition of the punishment in general, must have been peculiarly felt by this people on account of the natural condition of their land. וְלֹא עֲלֵיהֶם in this verse must necessarily be understood, as in the preceding, from which therefore יִהְיֶה הַגֶּשֶׁם

must be supplied, and by the *plague*, no other than that of the withholding of rain.

V. 19. "*This will be the sin of Egypt, and the sin of all the nations who will not go up to celebrate the feast of tabernacles.*" The interpreters mostly explain, "this will be the punishment," &c. But this explanation is to be rejected, even for this reason, because חַטָּאת and חַטָּאָה never occur simply in the sense *punishment of sin*, as is evident from a more accurate view of the passages cited for this idiom, e. g. Gen. 20: 9, Num. 32: 23. Besides, according to it, the verse would be a mere *resumption*, contrary to the custom of Zechariah, and would contain no new thought. The true interpretation was seen by Jerome, ("*Et hoc peccatum maximum erit Ægyptio, Assyrio, etc., si noluerint egredi de terris suis et ascendere Hierusalem*,") and Cyril. Formerly, nations were punished, on account of other sins; now, since the Theocratical dominion of the Lord was extended over the whole earth, there is only one great sin, before which the rest entirely disappear; only one cause of the divine judgments, the refusal of that reverence which they owe to their king, or its root, unbelief. This *one sin* is their refusal to go up to Jerusalem.

V. 20. "*In this day there will stand on the bells of the horses, Holy to the Lord, and there will be pots in the house of the Lord, as the sacrificial bowls before the altar.*" In the translation of the first member, the interpreters agree, only that several give to מְצִלּוֹת, *bells*, another meaning, either with the Seventy, and Vulg., *rein*, or with others, *ornament*, or *armour*, as Luther translates. It is also generally acknowledged, that the prophet alludes to the holy plate on the diadem of the high priest, whereon, according to Exod. 28: 26, was engraven (*et sculpes* עָלָיו) "Holy to the Lord," (קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה.) While, under the Old Testament, many things are designated as "holy to the Lord," this was the only one which bore the above inscription, and which therefore entirely coincided with that before us; since it is here by no means said, that the bells of the horses will be holy to the Lord, but upon the bells of the horses will be, stand engraven, "Holy to the Lord." The passages, which prove that it was an ancient custom, particularly in the east, to hang bells upon horses and mules, partly for use, for the same object for which it is done among us, partly for ornament, have been most diligently collected by *Dougtæus*, in the *Analectis Sacris*, p. 297, ed. 2. Thus it is said, e. g. by *Diodorus Sic.* 1. 18, ed. Wessel. II. p. 279, in the description of Alexander's fu-

neral procession : *ὥστε τοὺς ἅπαντας ἡμιόνους εἶναι ἑξήκοντα καὶ τέσσαρας· ἕκαστος δὲ τούτων ἐστεφάνωτο κεχρυσωμένῳ στεφάνῳ καὶ παρ' ἑκατέραν τῶν σιαγόνων εἶχεν ἐξηρτημένον κώδωνα χρυσοῦν.* And Nicetas Choniates says of the Persians, they sat upon beautiful horses, which besides other ornaments *καὶ περιηρτημένους ἔχουσι ἡχετικοὺς κώδωνας.* But, with this unanimity, there is nevertheless no little difference of opinion. The Jewish interpreters have wandered farthest from the truth, (the Jew questioned by Jerome; Jarchi, Kimchi, and Abenezra,) who, kept back from the true interpretation because this involved an abolition of the whole ceremonial law, understood the words of the consecration of the bells to sacred uses, and of the making of holy vessels out of them, in like manner as Grotius, for whom the true sense was too deep. He explains ; "*Quod cohæret equi tintinnabulis deo sacrabitur, cinctus nempe equorum, qui solebat esse ex matcria pretiosa et ornatus gemmis : hæc qui domum redibunt donaturos templo dicit.*" The untenableness of this explanation appears from the circumstance, that Grotius, probably feeling that the bells of the horses were a gift too insignificant for the Lord, insensibly adds to them their whole ornament. It appears still plainer from the comparison of the second member, and of v. 21, where the discourse is not, as must be expected according to this interpretation, of a gift dedicated to the Lord, but of a removal of the distinction between holy and profane. And lastly, it is still farther objected that, according to this interpretation, the allusion, which is plainly of deep import, to the plate on the forehead of the high priest, is converted into a very ordinary allusion. More plausible is another interpretation, which is found, e. g., in Mark, "*ea fore sanctissima et ad dei servitutem ac gloriam adhibenda, in quibus alias antiquitus maxima regnabat profanitas,*" especially after the embellishment which has been given to it by Fels, in the *Dissertatio ad Zach.* 14, 20, 21, *præs.* (J. H. Hottinger, Marb. 1711.) After having cited several examples of the custom of idolatrous nations, to designate persons and things with the image and name of an idol, (comp. 3 Macc. 2 : 21. Acts 28 : 11. Grot. on Apoc. 7 : 3, 13 : 16,) he shows from passages of the ancients, which are found still more fully collected in Brissonius (p. 172, and 340, sq.), and in Thysius (on Justinus, 1, 10, 5,) that the horses among the Persians were sacred to the sun, and then conjectured, relying especially on Curtius, 3. 3, according to whom there were images of idols on the chariot of Jupiter (Ormuzd), ("*utrumque currus latus deorum simulacra ex auro argen-*

toque expressa decorabant,") that it was the custom among the Persians, to write the name of their deity on the bells of their horses, and thereby to designate them as consecrated to him. He then shows how the cavalry, at the time of the prophet, was the pride and the strength of the Persians. The sense now, according to him, is, "The happy time will hereafter come, when the idolatrous nations will devote themselves and all that they have heretofore consecrated to idols, to the Lord." But this interpretation also appears on a nearer examination, as untenable. The second member, and v. 21, show, that the discourse here is not of any thing to be devoted to the Lord, but of something to be protected by him. This is also confirmed by the reference to the gold plate on the forehead of the high priest. For this was by no means a sign invented by man, whereby the high priest consecrated himself to God, but it was the symbol of the holiness, imparted by God out of grace to the high priest, and to him indeed as a representative of the people, as plainly appears from Ex. 28 : 38, ("And it shall be upon the forehead of Aaron, and Aaron bears therefore the guilt of every holy thing which the children of Israel consecrate; and it shall be upon his forehead continually, to render them acceptable before the Lord,") according to which this symbol implies, the holiness imparted by God, which is in its own nature perfect, so that the people so long as this relation continued, notwithstanding the deficiency of their own holiness, which defiled all their sacred actions, were yet regarded and treated as holy by the Lord. The sense accordingly is, "With the symbol of holiness, which formerly only the high priest bore, will the Lord at that time adorn the horses." Herein a very deep truth is contained. With the fall of man originated the distinction between holy and profane To abolish this, to give sole dominion to that which is holy, was the design of all the divine institutions; while the prince of this world strove, on the contrary, entirely to abolish that which is holy. In order the more surely to gain his final purpose, the Lord for a long time suffered the contrast to become greater and greater. He separated to himself one holy people, in comparison with which, all others were profane; he gave to this people a law in which the separation between holy and profane extended from the greatest to the least. He contented himself for a long time with only one certain outwardly defined province, because otherwise, if both the opposing principles had been mingled with one another, the evil would entirely have swallowed up the good. With the first manifestation of Christ the

last design of God began to approach its realization; the *external* contrast between the profane and the holy now became less obvious, because, by the Spirit of Christ, a far stronger support and aid was given to the latter. Both however still continued to exist; even in the believer the good does not attain in this life to complete and sole dominion. Hereafter, however, when the Lord shall be all in all, a time will come when every contrast of the holy and the unholy, every impure mixture of both, every distinction of degrees even in that which is holy, will cease. The case is analogous, when, according to Jer. 31 : 40, the whole valley of corpses shall be קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה, and brought within the circumference of Jerusalem. As the first member predicts the conversion of all that is profane into that which is holy, so the second, the doing away of the distinction of degrees between the holy things themselves. To the most holy vessels, under the old covenant, belong the bowls before the altar, the basins, into which the blood of the victims was received and then from them sprinkled against the altar and poured out at its foot. For of all vessels, these were most immediately used for the most holy service of the Lord. To the utensils on the contrary, which were the least holy, belonged the pots, those, viz. in which the flesh of the victims was cooked. For that these are here spoken of, appears from v. 21. They were used in the service of man. The Jewish interpreters, according to their opinion of the eternal duration of the ceremonial law, for the refutation of which this passage alone, as well as that Mal. 1 : 11, is sufficient, *must* endeavour here also by a forced explanation to set aside the true sense, which is so unpleasant to them. Thus Kimchi remarks, whom Abarbanel follows: "*Verba exponenda sunt de æquali numero craterum et ollarum; ita vertit Jonathan:* כמזרקיא כגיאין. *Nam quemadmodum plurimi erunt in domo Adonai pro sanguine spargendo crateres, (quando permulti erunt, qui sacrificabunt; etenim omnes, qui festum celebraturi venient, sacrificia offerent,) ita ollæ secundum offerentium numerum augebuntur.*" Such is the nature of this interpretation, that we wonder how several Christian interpreters (Vatablus, Drusius, Grotius) could have adopted it. That *the multitude* is the *tertium comparationis* is an entirely arbitrary assumption; on the contrary, holiness is plainly enough designated as such, by the addition לִפְנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ at מִזְרָקִים, in like manner as by the connexion with the foregoing, where the subject of discourse was holiness. Besides, the cooking pots must always have been comparatively far more numerous, than the bowls before the

altar, and we see not how the former could be compared with the latter, in order to represent their number as very great. Lastly, in the following verse also, as well as in the first portion of this, the discourse does not relate to the increase of the vessels of the temple, occasioned by the crowd of those who presented sacrifice, but to a conversion of all that is profane into what is holy. Ezekiel, chap. 43: 12, 45: 3, expresses by another image the same thought, the doing away of all degrees of difference among holy things. The whole mountain, upon which the new temple stands, will be the holiest of all, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים.

V. 21. "*And every pot in Jerusalem and Judah will be holy to the Lord of Hosts, and all the offerers come and take therefrom, and offer therein, and there will be no more a Canaanite in the house of the Lord of Hosts in that day.*" As the pots in the temple will be all equally holy with the sacrificial bowls, so all pots in Jerusalem and Judah which heretofore were only clean, not holy, will be equally holy, as the pots in the temple. In the last words, several take כְּנַעֲנִי in the sense *merchant*. Thus Jonathan: ולא יהי עביד תגרא עוד בבית מקדשא "*et non erit amplius exercens mercaturam in domo sanctuarii;*" so Aquila (who, after Jerome, translates *mercator*, ἔμπορος), Abenezra, Kimchi, Abarbanel, Grotius; by far the majority of interpreters, however, take כְּנַעֲנִי, after the Seventy, as a gentile noun. And this interpretation, in comparison with the context and the parallel passages, is unconditionally to be preferred. When now the prophet says, that, at that time, there shall be *no longer* a Canaanite in the house of the Lord, it necessarily follows, that, at his time, Canaanites were found in the house of the Lord. For this reason alone, Canaanites, according to corporeal descent, cannot be intended; since the Gibeonites, whom several interpreters here mention, were not in the temple itself, from which all foreigners were kept at a distance with the greatest care. We have here rather an instance of the idiom, of frequent occurrence, whereby the ungodly members of the Theocracy themselves, in mockery of the arrogance founded on the outward participation of the same, are designated as heathen, or uncircumcised, or especially as Canaanites, or some other heathen people. Circumcision had the power of a seal of the covenant, only when the spiritual condition, typified by the outward action, actually existed; where this was not the case, the circumcision was considered void. As even the Pentateuch speaks of a circumcision of the heart, to which outward circumcision bound the Israelites, (comp. Deut. 10: 16, 30:

6,) so Jer. 4 : 4, (" Circumcise your heart, and take away the foreskin of your heart, ye men of Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem,") and chap. 9 : 25 (" for all the heathen are uncircumcised, and the whole house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart,") designates the ungodly Israelites as uncircumcised in heart. Ezekiel goes a step farther. He designates, chap. 44 : 9, the ungodly priests and Levites, not merely as uncircumcised in heart, but also in flesh, and as sons of the stranger. For that here, by the " uncircumcised," and the " sons of the stranger," not heathen properly, as most interpreters strangely enough assume, but the ungodly Levites are designated, appears, among other reasons, from the fact, that priestly actions, viz. the presenting of sacrifices, are attributed to these persons (comp. v. 7 with v. 15); farther from the גַּם־ in v. 10, which, by these interpreters (comp. e. g. B. Rosenm.) is unphilologically translated, *yea also*, or *moreover*, instead of *but;* and lastly, from v. 15 and 16, where, to the threatening against the *ungodly* priests and Levites, contained in v. 7 — 14, the prediction of a reward for the pious is opposed. Similar also is Is. 52 : 1 ; " There shall no more come into thee one uncircumcised, and unclean." — Gesenius there also takes " uncircumcised " in a figurative sense, see the proof in Vitringa. Examples of a designation of the ungodly by the name of one particular idolatrous people, distinguished by peculiar depth of moral depravity, are the following. Isaiah (chap. 1 : 10) addresses the princes of Israel directly as princes of Sodom ; the people, as people of Gomorrah. Zeph. 1 : 11, the destruction of the covenant people is announced by the words ; " the whole people of Canaan shall be extirpated." The Chaldee paraphrases very correctly, " *totus populus, cujus opera similia sunt operibus Cananæorum ;* " still there lies at the foundation, as is shown by what follows, an allusion to the import of the word *merchant*, which is too much magnified by Cölln (*Spicil. in Zepk.* p. 32.) The appeal to Ezek. 17 : 4, can prove nothing, since there also כְּנַעַן certainly cannot be translated by *merchant*. Babylon was a second Canaan. Ezek. 16 : 3, it is said, " Thus saith the Lord to Jerusalem; thine origin and thy descent are out of the land of the Canaanites, thy father is the Amorite, and thy mother a Hittite." Accordingly, the sense of the passage before us can no longer be doubtful. It is altogether parallel with such as Is. 4 : 3, " Whosoever remains in Zion, and is left in Jerusalem, he will be called holy." 60 : 21 : " Thy people are all righteous." Apoc. 21 : 27 : *Καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινὸν, καὶ ποιοῦν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος· εἰ μὴ οἱ γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ*

βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου. 22 : 15 : "*ἔξω οἱ κύνες καὶ οἱ φαρμακοὶ καὶ οἱ πόρνοι, καὶ οἱ φονεῖς, καὶ πᾶς ὁ φιλῶν καὶ ποιῶν ψεῦδος.* The mixture of the pious and ungodly, as it existed in the church of the Old Testament, and as it in part still continues in that of the new, with this difference, nevertheless, that the dead members who joint hemselves to it have no sort of right in it, and participate in none of its blessings, all of which are received only through faith, is here contrasted with the perfect purity of the church in the last days, to be effected by the Lord.

THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

Chap. 9 : v. 24 — 27.

GENERAL VIEW.

Daniel employs himself, in the first year of Darius the Mede, with Jeremiah, and his spirit is deeply moved, as he reads anew his well-known prophecy, according to which, the affliction of the covenant people, their servitude, should endure seventy years, after which, their return, and the commencement of the rebuilding of the city and the temple connected therewith, should take place. The sixty-ninth year had now already arrived (comp. *Beitr.* I. p. 181, ff.) The one chief object of the prophecies of Jeremiah (chap. 25 — 29), the overthrow of Babylon, had already happened ; the belief in the truth of the divine prediction in reference to the others, which now approached with a rapid step, and whose germ already existed, had therefore, in the visible state of things, a ground of support. Daniel was far from doubting the divine promise. But the less he doubted, the more firmly he trusted the mercy of God, the deeper he understood the divine justice, (for even this required the fulfilment of the promise, when it had once been given), so much the more did he feel himself impelled to intercede for the people, the temple, and the city of the Lord. The true *παῤῥησία* in prayer to the Lord flows indeed from the conviction, that we pray *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ*. The more definite the promise, the stronger the faith, and the more heartfelt the prayer. Daniel knew that the Lord would be supplicated for that, which he had already declared himself willing to give, (Jerome : *in cinere et sacco postulat impleri quod promiserat deus, non quod esset incredulus futurorum, sed ne securitas negligentiam, et negligentia pareret offensam,*) — as in the Psalms we constantly perceive, that the assurance of divine help, embraced with living faith, is always

followed by new supplications for the actual bestowment of the promised blessing. He at the same time reflected, that indeed the *that* and the *when* of the beginning, stood irrevocably firm; but in reference to the *how* and the *when* of the completion, the Lord had left himself free; and that in this respect, therefore, it was well worth the pains to address to the God, who heareth prayer, to whom belongs not a dead necessity, but a living freedom, the prayers, which he himself had excited in his heart. Daniel therefore sends up to the Lord, for the forgiveness of sins, for the restoration of the Theocracy, a prayer full of power and unction, whose spirit, like that of all prayer, which really deserves the name, is, "we do not present before thee our prayer, on account of our own righteousness, but of thy great mercy." The prayer is heard by him who had given it, and Gabriel, the mediator of all revelations, (comp. p. 25,) receives the command to impart to the waiting prophet the decree determined in heaven. The speediness of his coming indicates a joyful message. This is as follows. As a compensation for the 70 years in which the people, the city, and temple have been entirely prostrate, 70 weeks of years, seven times 70 years of a renewed existence, shall be secured to them by the Lord; and the end of this period, far from bringing the mercies of God to a close, shall for the first time bestow them on the Theocracy in their complete and full measure. With it, the finished forgiveness of sins, the introduction of everlasting righteousness, the actual conferring of the saving blessings, which the prophets promise, the anointing of a holy of holies, coincide. This general view, contained in v. 24, is followed, v. 25 — 27, by a more accurate detail, the date of the *terminus a quo*, the division of the whole period into several smaller, with a determination of the characteristic mark of each, the divine blessing, by which it is distinguished, the determination of the person by whom the last and greatest benefit shall be obtained, and of those, to whom it belongs, with the exclusion of those, for whom it is not destined. 1. As the *terminus a quo* of the 70 weeks, the command of God to rebuild the city, in its ancient extent and glory, is given, different from the *terminus ad quem* of the prophecy of Jeremiah, as this relates only to the return from captivity, and the first beginning of the rebuilding of the city necessarily connected therewith. The intermediate time between this *terminus* of Jeremiah, and that of Daniel, is not reckoned to the covenant people, with the same liberality with which the former intermediate condition, the 18 years from the fourth year of

Jehoiachim to the destruction of the city and temple, were included in the 70 years of affliction. 2. The whole period is divided into three smaller, 7, 62 and 1 week. The close of the first is distinguished by the completion of the rebuilding of the city; that of the second, by the appearing of an Anointed One, a Prince; that of the third, by the finished confirmation of the covenant with the many for whom the saving blessings designated in v. 24, as belonging to the end of the whole period, are destined. This last period is again divided into two halves. While the confirmation of the covenant extends through it, from beginning to end, the cessation of the sacrifice and meat-offering, and the death of the Anointed One, on which this depends, fall in the middle of it. 3. As the author of the saving blessings completed in the end of the 70 weeks, a Messiah, a Prince appears; who, after having in the end of the 69 weeks, from the *terminus a quo* entered upon his office, and throughout the half of the 70th week confirmed the covenant with many, dies a violent death, by which sacrifices and meat-offerings are made to cease, while the confirmation of the covenant continues even after his death. 4. The saving blessings to be bestowed through the Anointed One, are not destined for the whole people; on the contrary, the greater part of them, after being excluded for the murder of the Anointed One, from his kingdom and blessings, will become a prey of the host of a foreign prince: which, an instrument in the hands of an avenging God, will utterly destroy the fallen city, and the polluted temple.

The whole annunciation is of a consoling import, even that part of it, which relates to the destruction of the city and the temple, and which the more necessarily belongs to the whole, the more uniformly the prophets combine with the highest manifestation of the divine mercy the highest manifestation of the divine justice against those who despise the former. The purifying judgments of God are for his church, a blessing; for his believers, a joy. Comp., besides the passages already cited on Zech. 13 : 7., Is. 65 : 13, 14; 66 : 24. Mal. 3 . 21, Luke 21 : 28. 2 Macc. 6 : 13 : *καὶ τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἐᾶσθαι τοὺς δυσσεβοῦντας, ἀλλ᾽ εὐθέως περιπίπτειν ἐπιτιμίοις, μεγάλης εὐεργεσίας σημεῖόν ἐστι. κ. τ. λ.* Daniel had not indeed prayed for the obdurate and ungodly, but for those, who heartily joined with him in the penitential confession of sin. These are the only objects of all promises, and of the tender concern of the prophets. Daniel mourns over the destruction of the city and the temple by the Chaldeans. For by that, the outward Theocracy, which still existed, was in part

done away. Only in that respect, is the destruction of the city and temple the object of his complaint; only on that account does he pray for their restoration, comp. v. 15 — 19. It was entirely different in respect to the destruction here described. What could the prediction of the ruin of the outward temple contain in itself that was distressing, since it is accompanied by that of the anointing of a new holy of holies? What the cessation of the dominion of the Anointed One over the covenant people, since it is accompanied by the confirmation of the covenant for the many, who alone were dear to the prophet? What the abolition of sacrifices, since that which it partly only prefigured, and partly outwardly procured for the outward Theocracy, the forgiveness of sin and justification, should be first really and perfectly procured by the same event, whereby the sacrifice was done away? We now lament over the downfall of the Evangelical Church, as Daniel over the Chaldaic desolations. But, who of us would continue this complaint, if the Lord had made all new, and abolished all outward churches? Who would indeed bewail the loss of the *πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα*, the corpse, from which the spirit had departed?

The divine answer, according to the representation given, stands in the closest relation to the prayer of Daniel. This needs, in reference to v. 24, to be shown, in opposition to Michaelis (*Über die 70 Jahrwochen*, p. 12 ff.) and Jahn, (*Vaticc. Mess.* II. p. 124,) who, by misapprehending this relation, have been led to the most violent changes of the text. They affirm, that the inquiry is concerning the people, city, and temple; the answer, concerning the Messiah, according to the existing text. Daniel prays, that the captivity might come to an end at the termination of the 70 years predicted by Jeremiah. The answer must, in any event, refer to the same 70 years, and either promise, or produce the end of the captivity, after they have run their course. But these assertions rest on a pure mistake. Daniel was led to make his prayer by reading the prophecy of Jeremiah. But where do we find a word to show that he had prayed for the restoration in precisely the year designated by Jeremiah? His prayer was entirely limited to the restoration of the people, city, and temple; he nowhere makes mention of a time. That the question related merely to the outward restoration, is just as erroneous, as that the answer referred only to the Messiah. The chief supplication of Daniel relates to the forgiveness of sins, comp. v. 19. And as this, according to the uniform prediction of all the prophets, would first

be vouchsafed most completely by the Messiah, so the prayer for it, included in itself, that for the coming of his kingdom. The prediction of the forgiveness of sin, to be effected by the Messiah, stands in close connexion with the confession of sin in v. 5. That the answer does not speak of the people, city, and temple, who can assert, since it begins immediately with the words, "70 years are determined upon thy people, and upon thy *holy* city," which predicate presupposes the existence of that which made the city holy, the temple? How could Daniel's prayer for the restoration well be more signally answered, than by the annunciation, that it should not merely happen in general, but should also endure through so long a period? Exactly as, in chap. 10 — 12, the disclosures, which Daniel supplicates, in consequence of a special mournful event, respecting the future condition of the covenant people, far surpass his prayer. That the prediction, that at the end of 70 weeks, those greatest of all blessings should be bestowed upon the covenant people and upon the holy city, presupposes its continuance during this time, was seen by the older interpreters; for their neglect of whom, Michaelis, Jahn, and others, have had to suffer. Thus e. g. Frischmuth remarks, in the *Thes. Theol. Philol.* I. p. 905: "*Scopus angeli est indicare, ecquid sit populo et urbi futurum, nempe hanc reædificandam, et populum, qui 70 annis exilio hæserat, suam politiam habiturum, et quidem septuplo diutius, quam in exilio egerat.*" And what, in v. 24, is intimated merely as a grand sketch, in accordance with his design, is farther carried out in the following verse. That the answer must refer especially to the *terminus ad quem* given by Jeremiah, can be required only by the false supposition, that Daniel had doubts, whether God would adhere to this. If he were certain of this, which could not be otherwise, he only needed instruction concerning the far greater and more important matters, with which the answer is concerned.

INTERPRETATION.

Verse 24.

"Seventy weeks are cut off upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to shut up transgression, and to seal up sin, and to cover guilt, and to bring everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophet, and to anoint a holy of holies."

"*Seventy Weeks.*"

The word *weeks* is here *masc.* in form and construction, while it is elsewhere commonly *fem.* This has given a welcome pretext to those, who wished to change the text, and led those, who retain it, to several erroneous opinions. Thus Bertholdt (p. 646.) asserts, that the *masc.* form, elsewhere not used, has been chosen here only on account of the similarity of sound, with שִׁבְעִים, not considering, that שָׁבוּעַ not only here, v. 27, which might indeed be explained by the influence of the use of the *masc.* form in the verse before us, but also chap. 10 : 2, occurs as *masc.* in respect to form and construction, without any reference to שִׁבְעִים. Ewald (p. 319.) asserts an entirely arbitrary confounding of the gender, as is often the case in later writers. But we can only have recourse to this supposition, when the assumption, on which it rests, of the elsewhere exclusively feminine gender of this word, is established by a thorough investigation. This, however, is by no means the case; that the word was originally *masc.* appears on the contrary, from Gen. 29 : 27, מַלֵּא שְׁבֻעַ זֹאת, "Make full the week of this one, first celebrate with her the festival of seven days." The *masc.* form, which here occurs in a word in which the gender is so little included in the idea, shows that it was originally regarded as *masc.* In these words, however, in which the *fem.* is only ideal, and more or less arbitrary, we still discover almost uniformly traces of the original *masc.* This coexistence of both genders must be supposed in the word before us, the more because it is properly a participle *septemized.* In attributive words, however, whether adjectives or participles, the gender is regularly expressed in the form; comp. Ewald, p. 308; so that the existence of the *masc.* form שָׁבוּעַ implies also that of the *masc.* gender. שָׁבוּעַ with the plur. שָׁבֻעִים is a *septemized* period, שָׁבוּעָה, of which the plur. שָׁבֻעוֹת is a *septemized* time. In both cases עת is properly to be supplied,

and there is less occasion to assume a determination of the gender, since in this word it is still doubtful. How little שָׁבוּעַ and שָׁבֻעָה has laid aside its nature as an attributive, appears from Ezek. 45: 21, where the passover is called חַג שָׁבֻעֹת יָמִים, "the feast of the septemized (periods) of days;" the feast, where the days are divided into septemized periods, where, during seven days, unleavened bread is eaten.

In favor of placing the numerals last, a circumstance, from which in like manner an argument has been drawn, to render suspicious the correctness of the text, numerous examples are found in the numbers from 20 to 99, comp. Gesen. Lehrg. p. 698. It may here well have been occasioned by the effort to render prominent the antithesis of the "weeks of years" with the "years" of Jeremiah. The usual position of words is departed from, when a word is to be rendered emphatic; comp. Ewald, p. 633.

But what justifies us in understanding by the weeks, weeks of years, periods of seven years? One reason, which interpreters usually bring forward, viz. that the prophet, while, chap. 10: 2, he designates the usual weeks, as weeks of days, himself intimates, that he speaks before of another sort of weeks, appears, as Sostmann, *De* 70 *Hebdom.* Lugd. 1710, has already shown on a nearer examination, as untenable. It is there said, "I, Daniel, mourn;" שְׁלוֹשָׁה שָׁבֻעִים יָמִים. That we must not here translate, "three weeks of days," but "three days long," that יָמִים is the same, which is very often subjoined to the determinations of time in order to show that they are accurate even to the day, is evident from the *stat. absol.* שָׁבֻעִים. The chief ground is rather the reference to the 70 years of Jeremiah. From this we learn, that 70 ordinary weeks cannot be intended. For, what sort of a consolation would it have been for Daniel, if it had been announced to him, that, as a compensation for the 70 years of desolation, the city should continue 70 ordinary weeks, until a new destruction? Moreover, Daniel himself could perceive, that the discourse did not refer to ordinary weeks, from the variety of the events, which should occur within the period. But, if the weeks spoken of were extraordinary, he would be the more compelled to regard them as weeks of years, since these weeks occupy so important a place in the Mosaic constitution, and since the exile had brought them anew into lively remembrance, inasmuch as the 70 years' desolation was considered as a punishment for neglecting to celebrate the sabbatical years; comp. 2 Chron. 36: 21. It is true, that these periods of seven years in the

law are not called שָׁבְעִים or שְׁבֻעוֹת, but that they were nevertheless to be considered as weeks, appears from the frequent designation of the 7th year, as the great Sabbath, or as the Sabbath simply; comp. Lev. 25 : 2, 4, 5, 26 : 34, 35 : 43, 2 Chron. 36 : 21. The obscurity, which perhaps would have still remained, has been removed by the fulfilment. We cannot fail to perceive, that the more indefinite determination of time, the import of which must have been more concealed, as it lay in the word itself, was intentionally chosen, in order not to destroy the boundaries between prophecy and history. The effort to avoid, on the one hand, an uncertain indefiniteness, which might be made an objection against the divine origin of the prophecy, and prevent its aim; and, on the other, the destruction of its proper relation to history; appears throughout in this section, and has been in a wonderful manner realized. An entirely analogous example of a determination of time, indefinite in itself, but rendered definite by the aid of history, is found in Zechariah himself, chap. 4, v. 20; comp. *Beitr.* I. p. 112 ff. But what induced the prophet to choose precisely this measure of time? In the first place, this very effort after *concealed* definiteness. This, in respect to what was concealed, could not be realized, if he used the ordinary mode of reckoning; if he gave the number of the years, which would elapse before the given *terminus ad quem*. And it could be just as little effected, in reference to the definiteness, if he had chosen an otherwise entirely unknown, and arbitrarily invented measure of time; such an one, perhaps, as the prophetic years of Bengel. It might then have been replied, that it were very easy to give such determinations of time, which were rendered definite *solely* by the fulfilment. Another ground is furnished in its relation to the 70 years of Jeremiah. It was very important in respect to the relation of the divine mercy to the divine anger, that, to the 70 years, which, according to v. 2, should be completed upon the ruins of Jerusalem, there should be placed, in opposition, a 70 of another sort; multiplying the 70 years by 7, to be enjoyed by the city after it should be rebuilt. And besides, 7 and 70 were perfect and sacred numbers, and the more adapted to the divine chronology, as the remembrance of the creation of the world was connected with them. Lastly, the choice of this determination of time with reference to the year of Jubilee, cannot well be doubted. *Seven* weeks of years lasted the cycle, in the end of which fell the civil *restitutio in integrum;* all debts were remitted; all slaves emancipated; the alienated lands restored to their possess-

ors. The last of 70 weeks of years, is the highest of all Sabbaths, the time of the spiritual *restitutio in integrum*, the removal and the expiation of all guilt.*

"*Are cut off.*"

Here, the apparent anomaly of the number first requires an investigation. It is explained by the circumstance, that the 70 Hebdomades here come under consideration, not as particulars, but as one whole, i. q. a *period* of 70 Hebdomades is determined. Analogous, e. g., is Gen. 46 : 22, "this the sons of Rachel," אֲשֶׁר יֻלַּד לְיַעֲקֹב, not the individual sons with the individuals, but the whole posterity of Jacob by Rachel, is contrasted with that by the remaining wives; comp. 35 : 26, Jer. 44 : 9 : "Have ye forgotten the wickedness of the kings of Judah?" וְאֵת רָעוֹת נָשָׁיו. The stress is here laid not on the individual kings, as such, but on the whole body of them, Eccles. 2 : 7, "men-servants, and maid-servants," וּבְנֵי בַיִת הָיָה לִי. In all these cases, precisely the opposite of the rule occurs, (comp. Ewald, p. 640.) "Nouns in the singular can be joined, according to their import, with the plural, when the object consists of individual, independent members, particularly persons." In such cases, the *fem. sing.* regularly stands. Where, instead of this, as in the cited passages, and in that before us, the *sing. masc.* is placed, a reason for it can always be shown. Thus, Gen. l. c., Eccles. 2, Jer. 44, the inappropriateness of joining male individuals with the *fem.*; in the passage before us, because the author did not consider the 70 weeks as an abstract, for which the *fem.* is the distinguishing form, but because there was before his mind a definite noun, time, or space, comp. עֵת as *masc.* 11 : 14. Perfectly corresponding is Eccles. 1 : 10. לְעֹלָמִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִלְּפָנֵינוּ.

The meaning of the ἅπ. λεγ. הָתַךְ is sufficiently ascertained, by a comparison of the Chaldaic and Rabbinic חתך, *to cut off*. True,

* There are to be found also in heathen writers, traces of a similar mode of reckoning. Marcus Varro, after he had developed, in the first of his books, called *Hebdomades*, the significancy of the number 7 in natural things, (in 4. 11; the extract in Gellius, 3. 10,) subjoins, "*se quoque jam duodecimam annorum hebdomadam ingressum esse, et ad eum diem septuaginta hebdomadas librorum conscripsisse.*" Here also, as in Daniel, the choice of this mode of reckoning rests on definite grounds; partly on the preceding exhibition of the importance of the number 7, partly on an intentional combination of the 7 years, and 7 books.

J. D. Michaelis asserts (*Über die 70 Wochen*, p. 42.), that this Chaldaic and Rabbinic חתך might very well have been derived from the passage before us; but this supposition would then only be probable, if the word there, as in the Targum, Esth. 4 : 5, was used only in the figurative sense, *to decide, resolve*. This might have been conjectured in the passage before us, from the connexion. As, however, חתך occurs also in the literal sense *to cut off*, (comp. חֵיתוּכִים, *partes, portiones, pars secta et abscissa*, חתיכת של בשר according to the *Miklal Jophi, incisio carnis*,) which could in no way be inferred from this passage, the suspicion seems to be groundless. Several interpreters also assume, that *to cut off*, here stands precisely for, *to resolve*, appealing to the fact, that the verbs of abscission in the Shemitish languages are not unfrequently used in the sense of determination, (comp. examples, among others, in Gesen. *Thes.*, s. v. גזר.) Thus the Seventy: ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες ἐκρίθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν σου. But the very use of the word, which does not elsewhere occur, while others, much more frequently used were at hand, if Daniel had wished to express the idea of determination, and of which he has elsewhere, and even in this portion, availed himself; seems to argue, that the word stands here from regard to its original meaning, and represents the seventy weeks in contrast with a determination of time ἐν πλάτει, as a period cut off from subsequent duration, and accurately limited. Thus was the word understood by Theodotion, who translates it by συνετμήθησαν. It is true, that Theodoret, in commenting upon the translation of Theodotion, asserts, that συντέμνειν here has the meaning of determining (συνετμήθησαν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐδοκιμάσθησαν καὶ ἐκρίθησαν· οὕτω γὰρ τινὲς ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐκδεδώκασιν), and this assertion has been repeated by modern critics, as beyond all doubt, (comp. e. g. Schleusner, *Thes.*, s. v., and Von Cölln, in the *Analekten*, 3. 2, p. 38). But it is entirely wanting in proof, from the usage of profane writers, as well as of the Greek translators. Kypke, on Rom. 9 : 28, has shown that συντέμνειν has always the sense *circumcidere, abbreviare*, never that of *decernere, decidere*. In this sense, the Vulgate, also, (70 *Hebdomades abbreviatæ sunt super populum tuum*,) takes the Hebrew and Greek expression. A shortened time, is a time accurately determined and limited.

"*Over thy people, and over thy holy city.*"

The words עִיר קָדְשׁ are considered as a compound noun, and the *suff.* relates, therefore, to the compound idea. Cases like this, where the *suff.* relates, not to God, but to Daniel, show very plainly, that translations like that of הַר־קָדְשִׁי in Ps. 2 : 6, by "mountain of my holiness," are not justified even by the addition, "literal." Among the Jews, the ignorance of this construction, which always occurs when the second noun describes only an attribute of the first, and therefore serves only to complete the idea, — comp. e. g. Prov. 24 : 31, גָּדֵר אֲבָנֶיהָ, "her stone wall," Eccles. 12 : 5, בֵּית עֹלָמוֹ, "his everlasting house," Is. 64 : 10, Neh. 9 : 14, — has been the occasion of even doctrinal absurdities. They conclude, from Is. 56 : 7, where the Lord calls the temple בֵּית תְּפִלָּתִי, that God himself prays.

Why is Jerusalem called the holy city of Daniel? After Theodor., Chrysost., Jerome, Vitringa remarks, "*Non meæ sed tuæ, quod indignationis divinæ argumentum est, peccatis populi nondum expiatis.* But by this interpretation, an entirely foreign element is introduced into the context; the richer the blessings, which the Lord in this verse promises to his people, the less suitable is such a designation. The correct view is rather that of Ch. B. Michaelis, and others; the *thy* intimates the tender love of Daniel towards his people, as expressed in the preceding prayer. This love compelled Daniel to intercession, and this latter is in v. 23, represented as the occasion of the decree, which is here revealed to Daniel; so that the *thy*, at the same time, reminds him of this occasion, comp. 12 : 1.

"*To shut up transgression.*"

In the word לְכַלֹּא is combined a double reading, which the interpreters have overlooked. The points do not belong to the *Kethib*, which is rather to be pointed לִכְלֹא, but to the *Keri*. That such a supposition is not by any means, in general, to be rejected, appears from the following remarks. When the difference between the received reading, and the supposed emendation, consisted only in the vowels, the Masorites did not write in the margin the consonants of the latter, which coincided with those of the former. They indicated a double reading by another method, which varied indeed according to circumstances. 1. Where the word itself, or the context, did not

distinguish as such the vowels of the marginal reading, which were placed under the reading of the text, where, therefore, entirely against their principle, the marginal reading, if they had simply placed under its points, would have appeared as the only one, they gave to the word a mixed punctuation, taken from both readings. An example of this is furnished by יִרְדֹּף Ps. 7 : 6. The reading of the text was here יִרְדֹּף, as *fut.* in *Pi.* The Masorites chose to read instead, the *fut.* in *Kal* יִרְדֹּף, because *Kal*, in the sense *to persecute*, is far more frequent than *Pi.*, which, however, as an intensive form, was particularly suitable here, where the most violent, repeated, and unceasing persecution was to be designated. That the word combined in itself a twofold punctuation was sufficiently indicated by the form, which, without this supposition, was a grammatical absurdity. In several manuscripts, whose authors were bolder than the Masorites, precisely the form יִרְדֹּף occurs. Another example is תֶּחֱצָחִי, Ps. 62 : 4, in many editions and manuscripts. The reading of the text is here תֶּחֱצָחִי, as a rarer form of the *fut. Pi.*, with the rejection of *Dagesh*, the place of which is supplied by the lengthening of the preceding vowel; the marginal reading תְּחַצְּחִי, as the usual *fut.* in *Pi.* Also Ps. 80 : 11, in כָּסּוּ, properly no form at all, a double reading is combined; that of the text כָּסּוּ, præt. *Kal;* that of the margin כִּסּוּ, præt. *Pi.* The Massorites were led to their supposed emendation, by a misunderstanding of the construction which necessarily requires the intransitive *Kal* (instead of "the mountains were covered with its shadow," they explain, "its shadows covered the mountains," with an inadmissible understanding of צֵל as a collective), and also by the fact, that כסה in Kal does not elsewhere occur in the Præter. In the manuscripts, this combination of a double pointing is still more frequent than in the editions; comp. Michaelis, *Or. Bibl.* III. p. 236, Ewald, p. 489. 2. Where, from the context, or from the word itself, the vowels could be known as not belonging to the reading of the text, the Masorites simply place them under it. An example is furnished Ps. 59 : 11. The reading of the text is אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדּוֹ יְקַדְּמֵנִי, *deus meus, gratia ejus præveniet me.* The Masorites preferred to read אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדִּי יְקַדְּמֵנִי, "my gracious God will prevent me." They gave now to אלהי precisely the points of the marginal reading, because every one immediately saw, that, on account of the following חַסְדּוֹ, these did not suit the reading of the text. — To this last class belongs the case before us. The verb כלא never occurs in Piel; it was sufficient, therefore, to give to the word the vowels of

Piel, in order to show, that, along with the usual reading, sufficiently indicated by the form itself, there was another, which pointed the form according to its derivation from כלא = כלה.

We now investigate the sense which both readings give. All senses of the verb כלא unite in that of *hindering*, *restraining*, and *limiting*. From this general meaning, that of *shutting up*, and *locking up*, is easily derived. This is found, e. g. Ps. 88 : 9, "I am shut up, כָּלוּא, and cannot go forth." Jer. 32 : 2, 3, בֵּית כָּלֶא and בֵּית הַכְּלוּא has the meaning *prison*. The interpreters here, for the most part, adopt the general meaning, that transgression shall be controlled. The special meaning, *to shut up*, however, agrees better with the following, *to seal*, and *to cover*. The sealing presupposes a shutting up.

The marginal reading, "to finish trangression," can be explained in two ways; either "to fill the measure of sin," comp. Gen. 15 : 16, Matt. 23 : 32 (*ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*), or, "to make an end of sin." Admitting the correctness of the marginal reading, the latter explanation should unquestionably be preferred. For, as we shall afterward see, the discourse, throughout the whole verse, relates only to blessings, and not to punishments.

If now we inquire, which of the two readings is preferable, we must unquestionably decide in favor of that of the text. An important advantage in its favor is derived even from the general relation of the marginal readings to those in the text. A more careful examination shows that the *Keris*, with few exceptions, are mere sudden thoughts of illiberal Jewish critics, and therefore have no more external authority than the conjecture of a Houbigant, and J. D. Michaelis. The decision of Danz is almost perfectly justified (*Litter. Hebr. Chald.* p. 67.): "*Non datur* כתיב, *quod exercitatis ac omnia accurate perpendentibus non pariat sensum commodum; quidquid huic sub nomine* קרי *quocunque prætextu superadditur, inventum est mere humanum et aliam penes me notam non invenit, quam interpretationis ut plurimum satis feliciter institutæ, subinde tamen temere et in ignominiam sacri scriptoris susceptæ.*" Here, however, there is the less reason to suppose an external authority, as the ground of the *Keri*, since the difference consists merely in the vowels, as the Masorites themselves did not venture to substitute כְּלָה for כלא, but only, by their punctuation, to express the opinion, that כלא here stood for כלה; a mere exegetical conjecture, which is not raised to any higher dignity by its appearing to have been entertain-

ed by the ancient translators, (Aquil. and Theod. *τοῦ συντελέσαι.* Seventy, *συντελεσθῆναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν*); especially, as its origin can be so easily explained. In the expression, which does not elsewhere occur, "to restrain," or "shut up sin," they found great difficulty; the meaning, *to finish*, seemed admirably to suit what followed, as well according to the marginal reading, as that in the text. For those, also, who followed the latter, unanimously explained the *sealing*, by *ending, completing*. What, however, especially favored the marginal reading, was the effort of the Jews, which is seen in their interpreters almost without exception, to convert the promises of the verse into threatenings; which was altogether natural, since they well knew the punishments, which ensued at the end of the 70 weeks of years, but not the blessings, and therefore must have been desirous to do away the references to the latter. Even Aquila translates, instead of "upon," &c. *κατὰ, contra, τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας σου*, and, corresponding with this, the following, *τοῦ συντελέσαι τὴν ἀθεσίαν καὶ τοῦ τελειῶσαι ἁμαρτίαν.*

That the prophet has used כלא in the sense of כלה, could be established only by certain proofs, as כלה is often found in him, and constantly with ה (comp. v. 27, 11 : 36, 12 : 7), and as, in general, the roots with ה much more seldom borrow forms from those with א, than the reverse, (comp. Ewald, p. 453,) so that we cannot appeal to the forms of כלא frequently borrowed from כלה. כלה is never found with א. The proofs therefore must consist solely in the internal advantages of the marginal reading. These, however, cannot be found, any more than the external. The admirable suitableness of *shutting up, sealing, covering*, to one another, decides in favor of the reading of the text. Sin, which hitherto lay naked and open before the eyes of the righteous God, is now by his mercy shut up, sealed, and covered, so that it can no more be regarded as existing; a figurative designation of the forgiveness of sin, analogous to those, where it is said, "to conceal the face from sin, and cause it to pass away," &c.

"*And to seal sin.*"

The *sealing* is here, by several interpreters, taken as a figurative designation of completing or finishing. So Theod. *ἐσφράγισε δὲ τὰς ἁμαρτίας, παύσας μὲν τὴν κατὰ νόμον πολιτείαν, τὴν δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος δωρησάμενος χάριν.* Several ancient interpreters reject the trope thus

understood, while Theodotion retains it. So the Seventy, *καὶ τὰς ἀδικίας σπανίσαι*; Aquila, *καὶ τοῦ τελειῶσαι ἁμαρτίαν*; Vulg., "*ut consummetur prævaricatio.*" That these translations are to be thus explained, and not, perhaps, as is commonly done, from a various reading, most evidently appears from the fact, that the Seventy in the following חָתַם also, where no trace of a various reading is found, again reject the trope (*καὶ συντελεσθῆναι τὰ ὁράματα καὶ προφήτην*), as also does the Vulg., *et impleatur visio et propheta*, while Theodotion, adhering to his verbal mode of rendering, translates *καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ὅρασιν καὶ προφήτην*, which, with exactly the same rejection of the trope, is explained by Theodoret, *τουτέστι τοῦ δοῦναι τέλος ἁπάσαις ταῖς προφητείαις.*

This explanation of *sealing*, by *bringing to an end*, is, however, untenable. It is true, that this import of חָתַם, arising from the custom of putting a seal at the end of a letter or writing, is very frequently met with in the Arabic. They say, ختم الشئ, ختم الكتاب, ختم الكلام; comp. a rich collection of examples by Franc. Tspregi, *Dissert. de Authentia Selectiorum Kthibim*, in Oelrich's *Collect. Opusc. Phil. Theol.* II. p. 153 sq. In Hebrew, however, it is never found. And the only passage cited in its favor, Ezek. 28 : 12., where חוֹתֵם תָּכְנִית is explained by *perficiens, absolvens pulchritudinem*, has been falsely interpreted. תָּכְנִית signifies, according to 43 : 10., *ground-plot, model.* Therefore חוֹתֵם תָּכְנִית, *a sealer of the ground-plot;* one who has a right to lay aside the idea of it, because he himself perfectly represents it. Entirely corresponding with which is the following, where the king of Tyre is called "full of wisdom, and *finished* of beauty." The figurative use of חתם in Hebrew, is exclusively taken from the custom to seal things for greater security, which a man has enclosed, or laid aside. Thus Job 37 : 7 : "God seals the hand of man; he shuts it up, so that it cannot move." Job 9 : 7 : "He seals the stars, shuts them up, so that they cannot give light." Jer. 32 : 11, 14, a sealed, and an open book, are contrasted with each other. In like manner, Is. 29 : 11, Cant. 4 : 12, a sealed fountain with an open one. In the book before us, we find the outward action, chap. 6 : 18, which lies at the foundation of the figurative representation, where the king seals the den into which Daniel had been thrown; and the figurative representation itself, chap. 8 : 26, 12 : 4, where the prophecies of Daniel, on account of their obscurity, are designated as sealed until the time

of the fulfilment, as Apoc. 22 : 10. (comp. *Beiträge*, I. p. 215.) Just as here כלא, *to shut up*, precedes חתם, so do, chap. 12 : 4 (" Shut up the words, and seal the book "), סָתַם, and, Deut. 32 : 34 (" Is it not concealed with me, sealed up in my treasure ? "), כָּמַס. Sin, therefore, is here described as sealed, because it was to be entirely removed from the sight of God, entirely put aside.

For לַחְתֹּם we have the marginal reading, the vowels of which stand under the reading of the text, לְהָתֵם, as *Infin.* in Hiph. from תָּמַם, *to be completed*. It owes its origin, most probably, only to the rejection of the trope in the ancient translations, which, being misunderstood, the traces of another reading were supposed to exist. The assumption of this reading was the more easy, since the form לְהָתֵם occurs also chap. 8 : 23, and indeed of the completion of sin and apostasy, which, for the reasons already given, there was a willingness to find in the passage before us. It maintained its usurped place by the help of the likewise illegitimate לְבַלֹּא, which again, in its turn, was aided by the former. It is true, Hitzig asserts (*Stud. u. Crit.* Jahrg. 1832. I. p. 176.) in its favor, that the circumstance, that לחתם follows, makes the Kethib suspicious. But this ground is converted into the opposite, when it is considered that the frequent repetition of the same words, belongs to the characteristic peculiarities of Daniel. Proofs in abundance are furnished, e. g. by chap. 11. They may, indeed, be drawn from the shorter portion before us. Thus the roots חרץ and שׁמם occur in it three times. — But even if this marginal reading, which thus wants all support, should be taken for the original one; still, we are not, even then, compelled to attribute to the words a threatening sense. " To finish sin," *can* mean, " to fill up its measure "; it can also just as well mean, " to make an end of it, by forgiveness," corresponding to the expression elsewhere used, " to blot out sin," מחה. In this sense תמם occurs of sin, e. g. Lam. 4 : 22 : " Thy transgression is blotted out, תַּם־עֲוֹנֵךְ, thou daughter of Zion. — But thy transgression, thou daughter of Edom, he will visit."

Instead of the plur. חַטָּאוֹת, the sing. חַטָּאת is found in not a few manuscripts and editions, in Kennicott and De Rossi. But we are surely not justified, with Bertholdt, in giving this reading the preference to that in the text. It probably owes its origin merely to the effort to make the word conform to פֶּשַׁע and עָוֹן. The sing. פֶּשַׁע stands also elsewhere along with the plur. חַטָּאוֹת, comp. e. g. Mic. I : 5, בְּפֶשַׁע יַעֲקֹב כָּל־זֹאת וּבְחַטֹּאוֹת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, which is explained by the

circumstance, that פֶּשַׁע, *apostasy, rebellion*, is more of a collective, while חַטָּאת designates rather the particular manifestation of sin.

Even if the reading of the text in both members is justly regarded as the true one, there would be nothing, so far as the words are concerned, against understanding the passage in a bad sense. We might regard sin as shut up and sealed, by the punishment and extirpation of the sinners, just as well as by the forgiveness of sin, as Is. 4 : 4, "By the destructive divine punishment, the filth of the daughter of Zion is washed away, and the blood of Jerusalem is removed from the midst of her." That this interpretation is nevertheless untenable, and that only a divine blessing is intended, the shutting up and sealing of sin by forgiveness, appears from the following reasons. 1. In the second part of the verse, a threefold positive good is mentioned, which the Lord at the end of 70 years will impart to his church. If we take the first two members in a good sense, the removal of a threefold evil corresponds to this imparting of a threefold good in the first part. This relation of the two halves, having each three members, to one another, must, however, be the more assumed, since only then would חתם be found in both halves in the second member. With sin, the prophecies also are sealed, because that which they predicted as future, as the chief mark of the Messianic time, the doing away of sin, has now taken place. This accurate correspondence of the twofold חתם, serves also to protect the first against the encroachments of the marginal readings. 2. There can be no doubt, but as the threefold designations of sin, which are elsewhere combined, comp. Exod. 34 : 7, above v. 5, must not be separated from one another; so neither must the threefold designation of that which is to be done in reference to sin, the *shutting up, sealing, covering*, especially as all three expressions are grounded on the same figurative representation of its removal out of sight. If, therefore, it can be proved of one of these expressions, that it can stand only in a good sense, this proof serves also for the other two. This, now, is perfectly the case with respect to כִּפֶּר עָוֹן. This frequent expression never designates any thing else than the forgiveness of sin, the covering of sin by the veil of mercy, so that the eye of the angry Judge cannot find it. 3. The prediction in the first three members stands in a close relation to the manifold confession of sin in v. 5., and the prayer for forgiveness connected therewith. On account of this relation, even if the third member were equally ambiguous, as the first two, we should prefer to understand it in a good

sense, because it is not probable, that the angel would have made such haste (comp. 22.), in order to announce to Daniel, directly the opposite of that for which he had prayed. Only through this prediction of prosperity, which preceded, did the announcement of the destruction of the city and temple lose its terrors. It now appeared as running parallel with the greatest blessings towards the pious members of the Theocracy, and, in so far as it put an end to their present mingling with the ungodly, even as a gracious benefit.

"And to cover transgression."

We adhere, in the translation, to the ground meaning of the verb כָּפַר. That regard is had to this, even when it is used of the forgiveness of sin, appears from the usual construction with עַל, and with בְּעַד, and indeed on account of the plain reference of the figurative representation in this member, to that in the two foregoing.

Several interpreters find a climax in the expressions concerning the forgiveness of sin, in the three members; but it is far more correct to assume, with Geier, ("*tot hic accumulantur vocabula, ut tota peccatorum humani generis colluvies eo melius comprehenderetur,*") a mere *συναθροισμὸς*, as is found also e. g. Exod. 34: 7, Levit. 16: 21. A climax would require that the strongest designation of sin should stand last. This, however, if the import of words is accurately considered, is precisely that which stands first, פֶּשַׁע. It designates sin according to its worst character; as apostasy from God, and rebellion against him, and e. g. Job 34: 37, "he adds עַל חַטָּאתוֹ פֶּשַׁע, to sin, transgression," is contrasted with חַטָּאָה, as the heavier with the lighter. The prediction of the forgiveness of sin, differs, therefore, in this relation from the confession of sin, v. 5, where a climax is actually found. The word כִּפַּרְנוּ entirely corresponding with פֶּשַׁע, which here first occurs, there comes after חָטָאנוּ וְעָוִינוּ. Even a progress from the greater to the less cannot here be assumed, since otherwise חַטָּאוֹת, as designating sin according to its lightest character, as a failure, must occupy the third place instead of the second.

"*And to bring everlasting righteousness.*"

Several interpreters, as Dathe, here take צֶדֶק precisely as synonymous with *prosperity*. But we have already (Vol. I. p. 411) shown, that this idiom, which some have attempted to establish, particularly from the second part of Isaiah, is not there found; comp. also Kleinert, *Isaiah*, I. p. 256. Righteousness, where it appears not as an inherent quality, but as a gift of God, always designates the same thing on the positive side, as forgiveness of sin on the negative; the latter implies that God, according to his free mercy, will regard men no longer as sinners; the former, that he will regard them as righteous. Hence, it necessarily follows, that he will also treat them as such, and, consequently, *righteousness* and *prosperity* are often combined with one another, though the former does not lay aside its proper sense. — Righteousness, as a gift of God, (comp. Ps. 85 : 11 – 14, where "righteousness looks down from heaven, and goes before God, who draws near to his people,") forms a constant characteristic mark of the Messianic times. According to Jer. 33 : 16, Jerusalem, at the time of the Messiah, shall be called "the Lord our righteousness"; according to 23 : 6, the Messiah himself will bear this name. According to Mal. 3 : 20, the Sun of righteousness will then arise upon those who fear God, i. e. righteousness that beams forth like a sun, and healing is under its wings. As "terebinths of righteousness" does Isaiah (61 : 3) designate the members of the kingdom of God in his time. The procuring cause of this righteousness we learn from Is. 53 : 11, according to which, the servant of God, the righteous one, shall make many righteous. — This righteousness is here called everlasting, on account of its origin from the eternal counsels of the everlasting God, as well as on account of its eternal duration, in contrast with the transient gifts of righteousness and grace under the old covenant, and with all that is created and mutable. This contrast is found, also, in several passages of Isaiah, where the eternity of the righteousness and prosperity of the Messianic time, is declared in the most emphatic manner. Thus e. g. chap. 51 : 6 – 8: "The heavens will pass away like smoke, the earth grow old like a garment, and its inhabitants die like gnats; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be destroyed, — my righteousness shall endure for ever, and my salvation through all generations." In like manner, 45 : 17, "Israel will be endowed by the Lord with ever-

lasting prosperity, תִּשּׁוּעַת עוֹלָמִים, ye shall not be ashamed; or brought to confusion in all eternity."

Our understanding of the words is found, after the example of the ancient translators, (The Seventy, *καὶ δοθῆναι δικαιοσύνην αἰώνιον.* Theodoret, *καὶ τοῦ ὀγαγεῖν δικαιοσύνην αἰώνιον.* Vulg., "*et adducatur justitia sempiterna.*" Syr., "*quæ ab æterno est,*") in the older interpreters, almost without exception, only that some, as the R. Bacharias in *Breschit Rabbah* on Gen. 14 : 18, by "everlasting righteousness," understand the person of the Messiah; the same mistake which also occurs with reference to the "Sun of righteousness," Mal. l. c., more, however, affecting the letter than the spirit, as Christ is he, in whom the treasure of the righteousness of the New Testament is preserved. Essentially different from that which has been given, is an explanation, which several recent critics, after J. D. Michaelis, have advanced, "the ancient righteousness, the innocence of former and better times." Against this, are the following objections. 1. All, the reference to the extirpation and expiation of sin predicted in the foregoing context; the connexion with the sealing of the visions and prophets, which, as we have already shown, p. 308, especially relates to the forgiveness of sin predicted by them; the collocation with blessings, plainly to be sent down from God; the verb לְהָבִיא; the comparison of the parallel passages of Isaiah; show that the discourse is here of righteousness, not as a subjective attribute, *morum probitas*, as also Scholl (*Comment. de* 70 *Heb. Dan.* Fft. 1829) explains, but as a gift of God; just as צֶדֶק occurs, besides in the passages cited, Ps. 132 : 9, "may thy priests be clothed with righteousness," by thee, O God, endowed with the garment of righteousness, "and thy saints rejoice," comp. v. 16. 2. The eternity of the Messianic kingdom, and its blessings, in the parallel passages of Daniel, where he is spoken of, are, in precisely the same way, rendered especially prominent; comp. 2 : 44, 7 : 18, 27. 3. It is false, that עוֹלָם was originally an indefinite designation of any longer duration, and that it commonly has this meaning, not that of *eternity*. In favor of such an assumption, it cannot be alleged, that the metaphysical conception of eternity is foreign to the simplicity of antiquity, and belongs to a later period of intellectual improvement. Antiquity had previously obtained views by immediate intuition, to which the later philosophers attained only by a tedious abstraction. In the very ancient Zend religion, "time without time," eternity, stands in the front of the whole system; comp. Rhode, p. 186: "The original being is called

Zervane Akerene, 'uncreated time,' only in reference to its duration, and by way of distinction from all other beings, which were created. Altogether in like manner is this original being, in the Schaster of Brama, called only 'the eternal, he, who is without beginning'." If, then, the idea of eternity, as existing from the beginning among these nations, cannot be denied, how much less can it be considered as unknown to a people enjoying a revelation, among whom the germ of the obscure anticipations of the heart among other people was developed by higher communications? In favor of this, as the ground meaning of עוֹלָם, is even the etymology of the word. עוֹלָם, a noun derived from the participial form of the verb עָלַם (comp. Ewald, p. 237), designates properly *the concealed, the obscure.* Eternity is an abyss, before which perception grows giddy; it, the infinite, is incomprehensible by the finite understanding; only in figure can a man represent it; concealed is its beginning, its progress, its end. "Just as, in a round ball, no beginning, no end is found; so also, O eternity, in thee, we behold neither entrance nor egress." "Thou art a ring, infinitely broad; thy centre is always, thy round circumference never, because it knows no end." "A little bird might well carry away the sand and stone of all the mountains, if he only came every thousand years; thou, eternity, remainest always." "With every moment which has already past, I compare many thousand thousand years; nothing compares itself with eternity." — Further, it cannot be denied, that עוֹלָם in the writings of the Old Testament, from the most ancient times, occurs in the sense of *eternity*, according to its full import, comp. e. g. Gen. 3:22, 21:33; Ps. 90:2: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, from everlasting to everlasting, thou art, O God." The ו is intensive, Ps. 103:17, Is. 51:6–8, where eternity is expressly contrasted with all time, and every thing that exists in it; 40:28, 63:16. On the contrary, the meaning of an indefinite duration in those passages where, at the first view, it seems to occur, completely disappears on a closer examination. These passages fall under the following classes. *a.* In several, the supposition of this meaning rests on an entirely erroneous interpretation. This is particularly the case in reference to עולם in one whole class of Psalms, which, as Ps. 18, 21, 61, 89, celebrating the mercies of God, not indeed, as is now for the most part assumed, towards one particular individual, but towards the whole royal stock of David personified as an individual, are an expression of the emotions called forth in the

holy songsters, by the word of God, 2 Sam. chap. 7, referring, in like manner, to the whole royal house of David. They differ from the proper Messianic Psalms, Ps. 2, 45, 72, 110, only in this respect: the latter exclusively bring forward the person, in whom the prosperity promised to the house of David should most completely appear; while the former, adhering more immediately to the ground-prophecy, embrace the whole of the prosperity, including its highest completion. That in these Psalms לְעוֹלָם *may* be taken in its full sense, who can deny, without making the kingdom of Christ temporary and transient; and that it *must* be so taken, we have already shown, Vol. I. p. 102. The same may be said of passages, as Jer. 6 : 16, 18 : 15, where the doctrine of godliness is designated as the everlasting way, נְתִיבוֹת or שְׁבִילֵי, עוֹלָם, not indeed merely as old, in antithesis with the new doctrine of the false prophets, but as eternal, like its eternal author, in whom it existed before it was revealed in time, as appears also from a comparison of Ps. 139 : 24, "Lead me in the way everlasting." — Truth is earlier than falsehood, because God is earlier than man, and the idols, man's workmanship. Nearly the same is true in reference to the passage in Job 22 : 15: "Hast thou indeed considered the everlasting way, which evil-doers tread?" The punishment of the ungodly is represented as everlasting, because, being grounded in the nature of the everlasting God, it existed in substance before the creation of the world, and became manifest as soon as it had an object. The same is true of Mic. 5 : 1, as we shall show on the passage; also Exod. 31 : 16, "The observance of the sabbath is for Israel בְּרִית עוֹלָם; v. 17, "Between me and the Israelites this is a sign לְעוֹלָם." The command respecting the celebration of the sabbath is so surely not done away by Christ, as he himself has declared, that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil, and no jot or tittle of the law shall fail. If that which was accidental and outward has ceased under the New Testament, the kernel and substance still endure; nay, the fulfilment of the commandment in its whole compass has now first become possible. — *b.* In other passages, the assumption of the meaning, "an indefinite duration," arises from not distinguishing between eternity objectively, and subjectively, considered. Subjectively, in conception, every period of time can appear as an eternity, which, objectively, is in itself by no means such, and which the cool, reflecting understanding is far from regarding as such. This eternity, to be measured according to the standard of human perception, is found in all languages;

and if any one, confounding perception or feeling, and reality, e. g. if a man, who has not seen his friend for several years, says to him, "We have been separated from each other a whole eternity," should choose to assert, that eternity actually signifies a period of some years, he would make himself ridiculous. Of this class of passages are such, e. g., as Is. 42 : 14 : הֶחֱשֵׁיתִי מֵעוֹלָם, "I have now already been silent a whole eternity;" 63 : 19, "We are those over whom thou hast not reigned from eternity." The time of the exile, though short in itself, appears to the suffering people to be an eternity. Ps. 77, (a Psalm of deep lamentation over past prosperity,) "I think of the days of antiquity, the everlasting years," the years, which have already been past, an eternity. Ps. 73 : 11, 12, "And they say, How does God know; how should knowledge be with the Most High? See, these are the ungodly, and the *eternally* secure, שַׁלְוֵי עוֹלָם, increase their strength." To the pious, the long prosperity of the ungodly appears as a whole eternity. Ps. 143 : 3, Lam. 3 : 6, — *c.* The case is analogous, when עולם occurs *hyperbolically* of things to which, if the subject alone is regarded, only the predicate of a long duration is suited. To infer from these passages, that עולם also could mean a limited period, were just as absurd, as if from the expression, "walled up to heaven," Deut. 1 : 28, it should be concluded, that "up to heaven" designated, among the Hebrews, a height of about one hundred feet. Examples are, Is. 63 : 9, "He raised them up and bore them (Israel) כָּל־יְמֵי עוֹלָם, throughout a whole long eternity." The unlimited thankfulness removes the limits of time from the blessing, and thus more effectually shames the ingratitude, which, in order to free itself from the burdensome duty of thankfulness, diminishes the favors of a benefactor. Mal. 3 : 4, "And pleasant to him is the offering of Judah, as throughout the days of eternity," כִּימֵי עוֹלָם, as it has been pleasant to him throughout a whole eternity. Not, which is unphilological, "as of old," so that כִּימֵי would signify, "as in the days." The hyperbole here has respect to weakness of faith, to which the comparatively short time of the withdrawal of the divine mercy appears as an eternity. That the time of mercy relates to that of wrath in times past, as eternity to a limited period, must strengthen confidence in this mercy, and hope in the fulfilment of the promise. Mic. 7 : 14, "They feed again upon Basan and Gilead, כִּימֵי עוֹלָם." Amos 9 : 11, "I build the tabernacle of David, as throughout the days of eternity," "as I have built it throughout a whole eternity." Is. 51 : 9. Hab. 3 : 6, "Before the Lord the ever-enduring mountains

were scattered, the everlasting hills were made low." The greater the power of the vanquished, the more illustrious the conqueror. The hyperbolic designation of the duration, and of course, the steadfastness of the mountains, magnifies the power of him before whom they are scattered like chaff. Prov. 22 : 28, "Remove not the everlasting limits." The *ancient* limits are hyperbolically designated as *eternal*, in order to awaken a stronger sacred dread at their removal. Is. 61 : 12, "And they build the everlasting wastes"; ancient wastes are designated as eternal, to express the thought, that the time will be happier than any which has preceded, and that what had lain through a whole eternity in ruins, would be rebuilt; comp. still Deut. 32 : 7, Gen. 6 : 4, Jos. 24 : 2, Jer. 5 : 13, Is. 44 : 7, Eccles. 1 : 10. — *d.* Wishes do not always bind themselves to what is possible, especially when it is the object of him who wishes, to give a lively representation of his feelings to him to whom his wishes refer. Human expectations and hopes, not grounded on the word of God, must not be confounded with divine promises, with which the result always perfectly corresponds. For example, the salutations addressed to kings, "The king live for ever," 1 Kings 1 : 31, Dan. 2 : 4, 5, 10, 6 : 22, Neh. 2 : 3; the use of which among the Persians, also, is evident from Ælian., v. *Hist.* 1. 31. (*βασιλεῦ Ἀρταξέρξη, δι᾽ αἰῶνος βασιλεύοις,*) comp. Brissonius, l. 1. p. 16, which should have been adduced in the *Beiträgen*, among the proofs of the accurate knowledge of the Chaldee-Persian manners in the book of Daniel. Josh. 4 : 7, "The stones shall be memorials for the children of Israel, עַד עוֹלָם." Job 19 : 24, 1 Kings 8 : 13, where Solomon says, "I have built thee a house, a place for thy dwelling, עוֹלָמִים." Solomon expected, that the temple built by him would be, to all eternity, the central point of the worship of the true God. — *e.* "Eternally" not unfrequently stands where a thing, all other causes of destruction being left out of view, is described only in respect to one in particular, as not liable to perish. That the word here retains its full meaning, is manifest. Eternity is predicted only in a certain relation. As examples, we cite the following passages. Gen. 13 : 15, "This whole land will I give to thee and to thy seed for ever." This promise gave the covenant people the certain assurance, that the possession of the land of Canaan *in respect to the giver*, should not be temporary. But to conclude from this, that the possession would be inalienable by all other causes, would have been as hasty, as when one should infer from Rom. 8, the impossibility that one, who had been born again,

could fall from grace. Ps. 104 : 5, 6, "He has established the earth on its foundations, it will not be removed for ever and ever," stands only in apparent contradiction to Ps. 102 : 26, 27, "Thou hast established the earth, and the heaven is the work of thy hands. They shall cease, and thou remainest." For in the first passage, the omnipotence of God is proved from the fact, that *no cause besides him* could move the earth, which he sustains; in the second, from the fact, that the most steadfast of created things should be destroyed by him, while he remains unchangeably the same. 1 Sam. 1 : 22, Hannah says, "she would bring her son before God, that he may dwell there עַד עוֹלָם," on which Gousset has already well remarked, "*quod si deus et ejus jussu Samuel aliter statuant, per ipsam saltem non staturum, quin id fiat, uti ipsa enuntiat.*" Eccles. 1 : 4, "Generations come, generations go, and the earth stands לְעוֹלָם;" the earth is represented only as not subject to all those causes of decay, which destroy all that is found upon it. Deut. 15 : 17, "And he shall be to thee for an everlasting servant, לְעֶבֶד עוֹלָם; the year of Jubilee shall, to all eternity, effect for thee no change in his relation to thee." In like manner Lev. 25 : 46, where servants out of foreign nations may be held as servants *for ever*, in contradiction to v. 39–42, where an Israelitish servant must be emancipated in the year of Jubilee. 2 Kings 5 : 27, "The leprosy of Naaman shall cleave to thee and to thy seed לְעוֹלָם." No regard is here paid to a future extinction of the race of Gehazi. Should this continue eternally on the earth, itself eternal, so also would the punishment of the leprosy be eternal. Ps. 30 : 13, "Lord, my God, to eternity will I praise thee." The Psalmist speaks only of what he will do in accordance with the inmost desire of his soul; if it only depends upon him, his praise of God shall not cease through all eternity. If now we apply the result we have obtained, to the passage before us, it is evident, that the explanation by ancient righteousness, is entirely untenable. As עוֹלָם can never of itself have the meaning attributed to it in this explanation, it can only be justified, by showing from the text itself, a reason for a subjective or hyperbolic understanding of eternity, (comp. under *b.* and *c.*) No such, however, is to be found. The word can be so understood, only where emotions and personal references prevail, as not only in the Psalms, but also in the predictions of the prophets, in which the hortatory character predominates. The prophecy before us, however, is purely objective, as generally in Daniel, who was no

prophet by office, who had no auditors around him; the direct hortatory character is entirely subordinate.

Still more to be rejected is the explanation of Bertholdt, who understands by צֶדֶק deliverance from a religious and political oppression, "the ancient freedom." Here, to equal caprice in the understanding of עוֹלָם is added still greater, in the interpretation of צֶדֶק. All these false explanations are occasioned merely by an incorrect hypothesis in respect to the reference of the whole verse. The natural and correct sense was not suited either to Michaelis and Jahn, who refer it to the time immediately after the Babylonish exile, or to Bertholdt, who supposes a reference to the times immediately after the oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes. — Finally, the pardon of sin, and the gift of the divine righteousness, in just the same manner as here, correspond in Ps. 69 : 28, "Impute to them their sins, and let them not receive a part in thy righteousness."

"*And to seal up vision and prophet.*"

The interpreters mostly suppose, that *to seal up*, here, is as much as *to fulfil*, *confirm*, *ratify*, with reference to the custom of confirming the contents of a writing, by affixing to it a seal. The existence of this custom among the Hebrews is supposed to be evident from 1 Kings 21 : 8, Jer. 32 : 10, 11, 44. They deduce as parallel, passages like Acts 3 : 18, "God has fulfilled, ἐπλήρωσεν, what he had before made known by the mouth of all his prophets;" Matt. 5 : 17. This import of *sealing* is found, indeed, in Syriac, (comp. e. g. Ephraem Syrus, *Hymn.* 80. *adv. Scrutat.* Opp. III. p. 149,) and in the New Testament, John 6 : 27. But it is entirely foreign to the Hebrew. We have already seen that this knows no other metaphorical use of חָתַם, than that taken from the custom of sealing things which are laid aside, and concealed. This meaning can the less be relinquished here, since it is, in general, unnatural to assume, that חָתַם occurs in a single verse in different senses; and the more so, since the sealing up of vision and prophect, even by position, (comp. p. 308,) manifestly refers to the sealing up of the prophecy. With the sealing up of sin, the prophecies also are sealed up, in which this was predicted. As soon as the fulfilment takes place, the prophecy, although in other respects it retains its great importance, reaches the end of its destination, in so far as the view of believers, who stand in need of consolation and encouragement, is no longer direct-

ed to it, to the future prosperity, but to that which has appeared; as they no longer rely on the word of the Lord, but on his deeds, and with Philip (John 1 : 46) exclaim : *ὃν ἔγραψε Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται, εὑρήκαμεν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ, τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ.* According to this interpretation, the passage is entirely parallel with Matt. 11 : 13, *πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν*, on which Bengel : "*nunc completum, quod usque ad Joannem fuerat prædictum*"; and also 2 Pet. 1 : 19 : *καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ, καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.* In this latter place, we have combined the sense of the two interpretations, the usual one, and our own. The *προφητικὸς λόγος* has, on the one side, gained in certainty, by the fulfilment; on the other, however, as a ground of hope and consolation, it has been thereby abrogated, as a man directs his eye to a feeble light, that can but poorly and imperfectly scatter the surrounding darkness, only until the clear day breaks; comp. Vol. I. p. 241.

The use of the *sing.* (comp. חָזוֹן *collect.*, Is. 1 : 1, 2 Chron. 32 : 32, Nah. 1 : 1; Kleinert, *Ueber die Aechtheit des Jes.* p. 11.) and the omission of the article, serve to designate the object in its widest universality. Comp. e. g. אָדָם וּבְהֵמָה תּוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה Ps. 36 : 7, and שֹׁכֵן תְּפִלָּה לְךָ יֶשְׁלַם נֶדֶר Ps. 65 : 2, also אָדָם Ps. 73 : 5. This universality can have a double aim, either to designate the object as unlimited, as in the cited passages of the Psalms, or to give in the representation an unlimited extension to that which is in itself confined. The latter occurs, e. g., chap. 11 : 14 : "The sons of the transgressors of the people will rise up לְהַעֲמִיד חָזוֹן, for the fulfilment of prophecy," where the prophet speaks altogether generally. — חָזוֹן is there to be taken collectively, — although he properly had in view one definite object, his own prophecy. It was not here important that the event served for the fulfilment of a special prophecy, but only for the fulfilment of prophecies in general. For this latter ground in favor of the universality of the expression, we may allege the remaining character of the section, in which the article is often omitted, where, if the expression corresponds to the definiteness of the subject, it must necessarily stand, comp. e. g. שָׁשִׁים v. 25. 26. — Bertholdt, Jahn, Rosenmüller, and others explain, "Until the declaration of the prophet Jeremiah is fulfilled." This explanation is, however, to be rejected, for the following reasons. 1. It rests on the false explanation of *sealing up*, by confining. That being correctly explained, their in-

terpretation could at most be admissible only in case חָזוֹן stood alone; by the addition וְנָבִיא, however, it is refuted; for how could a prophet be described as henceforth useless, because one of his prophecies had been fulfilled? Even if חָזוֹן stood alone, in case the prophet had in view a special prediction of Jeremiah, the indefiniteness of the language would still be very unusual. The violation of the rule, "The article is most necessarily used where a thing or person already mentioned is referred to," (Ewald, p. 566,) could then only be assumed when the prophecy of Jeremiah had been mentioned immediately before, so that it would at once occur to every reader, and thus the indefiniteness be removed, or when other circumstances in the discourse, as a striking agreement of the contents of the prophecy of Jeremiah, with that which is here promised, supplied the place of the article. 2. The abolition of חָזוֹן and נָבִיא can still happen in no other way, than by the accomplishment of that which is here predicted to take place at the end of the 70 weeks, especially the sealing of sin, to which the sealing of vision and prophet closely relates. The same must now also be promised in the prediction, or in both the predictions of Jeremiah, to which the prophet is supposed to refer. But of this there is there no trace to be found. Chap. 25, merely the cessation of the Babylonish servitude is promised, and chap. 29 is limited to the promise of the restoration and the merciful care of God.

There can therefore be no doubt that we have here a reference to the prediction which runs through all the prophetical writings, of the forgiveness of sin to be conferred in the days of the Messiah; comp. on Zech. 13 : 1. When this, the substance of the work of Christ, has been accomplished, the prophecies in the above-mentioned relation might justly be regarded as abolished.

"*And to anoint a holy of holies.*"

The defenders of the reference of the whole verse to the times immediately after the return from the exile, as Michaelis and Jahn, refer these words to the consecration of the temple, rebuilt by Zerubbabel and Joshua, while those, who prefer the time immediately after the oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes, refer them to the new consecration of the temple, profaned by the Syrians. In both cases מָשַׁח must be taken in an improper sense of a bare consecration, for we do not find during the first temple, nor the second, neither after its erection nor its profanation, the slightest evidence that the sanc-

tuary was anointed, as was the case according to Exod. 30 : 22, &c., during the tabernacle. On the contrary, according to the uniform tradition of the Jews, (comp. Lund, 1, 29,) the holy oil was wanting under the second temple. In the case of the first temple, the anointing might have been omitted, because the holy vessels of the tabernacle, which had already been anointed, were transferred to it. In respect to the second, it might well have been thought, in accordance with the character of that whole period, that it would be better to wait for the restoration of the old and most sacred oil, than to prepare new. An objection common to both interpretations is, that according to them, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים is understood of the "holy of holies" of the earthly temple, which is never so called, but, without any exception, קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים; comp. 2 Chron. 3 : 8, Exod. 26 : 33, 1 Kings 6 : 16. קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, on the contrary, serves always to designate other objects besides the "holy of holies," which in their kind are the most holy, as the altar of burnt-offerings, and other vessels in the sanctuary, in comparison with the court, &c. A look at Buxtorf's *Concordance* will show, that this distinction has been constantly observed. It is most clearly manifest, Ezek. 41 : 4, comp. 43 : 12, 45 : 3. In the former passage, the discourse relates to that part of the new temple, which should correspond with the "holy of holies" of the former temple; here קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים. In both the others, the prophet designates the whole compass of the mountain, on which the new temple should stand, as "*a* holy of holies," in relation to the former temple, to which, with the exception of the holy of holies, only the predicate of positive holiness was suited; here קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים. The only passage in which קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים at first sight seems to be used, without being rendered definite by the article, of the most holy place of the temple, is 1 Chron. 23 : 13, "Aaron with his sons were separated, לְהַקְדִּישׁוֹ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים." But this must rather be explained, *quidquid sacrosanctum erat*, as already Le Clerc, "*ut res sanctissimas, sacrificia, vasa sacra, consecrarent.*"

To delay longer with the first reference, would be useless, because its defenders themselves bear testimony against it, by the violent changes of the text to which they resort. The period of the 70 weeks of years can be proved with mathematical certainty, as that which belongs to the original text of the prophet. In order to be convinced of its correctness, we need only combine the following short periods, into which the whole is divided, 62 – 7 – 1. If, however, this is established, how can the new consecration of the earthly

temple be predicted, as not occurring until after 490 years? We may therefore proceed at once to consider the grounds, which, besides those already adduced, are opposed to the second reference. 1. The outward consecration of the outward temple is unsuitable to the connexion with the other gracious gifts of God, which are here promised. These are all spiritual; they refer to a destruction of sin; they bear a Messianic character. Even therefore should the passage be referred to the times of the Maccabees, we are not to think of the new consecration of the outward temple, as a mere external and human work. We must suppose that the prophet, connecting together the end of the oppression of religion, and the beginning of the Messianic kingdom, intended thereby something far greater. 2. Were the new consecration of the temple the subject of discourse, we do not see, even leaving the article out of view, why the prophet should speak only of the "holy of holies," instead of the whole temple. Bertholdt, p. 651, feeling this difficulty, throws out the conjecture, that the whole temple is here designated as a "holy of holies," in the sense in which the author of the second book of Maccabees (5 : 15,) calls it *τὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς ἁγιώτατον ἱερὸν*, or (41 : 31,) *τὸ μέγιστον καὶ ἅγιον ἱερόν*. But this expedient is inadmissible, because קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, although indeed of itself relative, yet, when used of the temple, in order to avoid ambiguity, never designates the whole, as holier than all besides; but only the holy of holies, in reference to the sanctuary. An appeal cannot be made to the cited passage of Ezekiel, which seems to make an exception. For there the discourse relates to an entirely new order of things; the whole compass of the new (Messianic) temple, is there, by a brief comparison, designated as a "holy of holies," equal in dignity to the former "holy of holies." 3. The subject of discourse cannot here be a new consecration of the old temple at the end of 70 weeks of years, because, according to v. 27, the same temple is at that time to be entirely destroyed. 4. This supposition is liable to invincible chronological difficulties, as the 490 years extend far beyond the time of the new consecration of the temple. That the attempts to set aside these difficulties, are entirely unsuccessful, we shall hereafter see.

Many other interpreters, justly rejecting the reference to the outward temple, explain the words of the anointing of the Messiah. These adopt a twofold course. Many translate קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים directly by, "*the* holy of holies," or what would be more correct, "*a* holy of holies." This interpretation was, in all probability, adopted by the Seventy

(καὶ εὐφράναι ἅγιον ἁγίων) and Theodotion (καὶ τοῦ χρῖσαι ἅγιον ἁγίων). That neither of them referred it to the "holy of holies" of the temple, is evident, because this is constantly designated by the Greek translators by ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων, or τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, or τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ ἁγίου, comp. Tromm. *Concord.* s. v. That they regarded it as *masc.*, appears from the εὐφράναι of the Seventy, which does not necessarily imply a different reading, שׂכח, but may well be regarded as a rejection of the trope occasioned by Ps. 45 : 8, where the discourse is of the anointing of the great king with the oil of joy; and the more so, as this tendency is manifested by the Seventy throughout the verse. Theodoret presupposes this interpretation to be correct, and as not doubted even by the Jews: τούτοις πάλιν προστέθεικε· καὶ τοῦ χρῖσαι ἅγιον ἁγίων· τίς δὲ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τῶν ἁγίων ἅγιος; εἰπάτωσαν Ἰουδαῖοι· εἰ δὲ ἀγνοοῦσι· παρ' ἡμῶν μαθέτωσαν, ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ δεσπότης Χριστὸς, διὰ μὲν Ἡσαΐου προλέγων· πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέ με κύριος, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ Δαβὶδ μαρτυρούμενος, ὅτι, κ. τ. λ. (Ps. 45 : 8.) This understanding of the translation of the Seventy, and of Theodoret, is the more natural, as the personal reference and the Messianic import can otherwise also be proved, as tolerably current among the Jews from the most ancient time. Comp. the passages in Raim. Martini, p. 285. Carpz. *Schöttgen*, p. 264. Edzard, *ad Abodah Sarah*, pp. 246, 247. In the Christian church, this interpretation, the last defender of which is *Scholl*, obtained, particularly by means of the Vulgate (*et ungatur sanctus sanctorum*), a very wide diffusion. In the mean time, however, we find very early doubts as to its correctness. Eusebius (*Demonstr.* VIII. c. 2.) remarks, he has never found in the holy Scriptures, that the high priest was called *sanctus sanctorum*. This ground, somewhat differently understood, viz., that קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, in holy Scripture, never occurs of persons, but always of things only, is alone sufficient to refute the interpretation. Were this accidental, the word would not occur so often (forty-three times). Of no weight is the remark of Scholl, p. 14, "*Non mirum hunc loquendi usum inusitatum esse, cum raro inveniantur personæ hoc nominæ dignæ.*" For he does not consider that קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, as the idiom sufficiently shows, is a relative conception, and only renders prominent the holiest of a multitude of things of the same kind (comp. on the expression of the *Superlative*, by the joining of a noun with the same noun in the *stat. constr.* Ewald, p. 575.), on which account, e. g., the high priest, in comparison with the priests, might well bear this name, if in general it were applied to persons; and moreover, apart

from this erroneous assumption, it would be difficult to give the reason why God and the Messiah, to whom alone the name is appropriate, are never designated by it. The difficulty is increased by the circumstance, that קָדֵשׁ also never occurs as a designation of persons.

Others, perceiving the force of this difficulty, take קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים as relating to things, and understand it of the "holy of holies" of the temple, but suppose the type to stand as a designation of the anti-type, appealing to the passages of the Old Testament, where Jehovah calls himself מְקֻדָּשׁ, Is. 8 : 14. Ezek. 11 : 19, and of the New Testament, where Christ compares himself with a *ναὸς*. So, e. g., Ch. B. Michaelis, and lastly, the reviewer of Scholl's *Comm.*, in Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* Jahrg. 1830. p. 233. By the objection, that קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים can designate not "*the* holy of holies," but only "*an* holy of holies," these interpreters are only required to modify, in a measure, their interpretation. Christ could be called a "holy of holies" as the "new temple," which should be exalted in glory as much above the former, as the "holy of holies" surpassed the sanctuary. The appropriateness of this brief comparison could be made still more clear, by the remark, that the cause of the superiority of the "holy of holies," that which made it such, the gracious presence of the Lord, is far more perfectly, completely, and gloriously afforded in Christ. Nevertheless, we cannot adopt this interpretation. We shall endeavour to establish our own, before we proceed to its refutation.

That the *anointing* cannot here be understood literally, we have already seen. We investigate now, the meaning of the figurative expression. The passages are first to be examined, where the outward action embodying the inward image, then those where the image, as such, occurs. To the first class, belong the following passages: Exod. 30 : 22, sq., 40 : 9, sq., the Lord commands Moses to prepare holy anointing oil, and therewith to anoint the tabernacle, its vessels, and the priests, who minister in it. The import of this symbolical action, we best learn from Zech. chap. 4. (comp. p. 42.) The oil is the symbol of the Spirit of God; the anointing of the temple, a sensible representation of the imparting of this Spirit in the Theocracy, which is thereby separated from every thing lying beyond the sphere of the gracious operations of God, and sanctified. Calvin: "*Certe ideo nos et omnia nostra sanctificat spiritus dei, quia extra ipsum profani sumus et omnia nostra corrupta.*" The outward holiness, which, according to Exod. 30 : 29, each one received by

touching the vessels of the temple, consecrated with the anointing oil, is symbolical of the inward holiness, which each one receives, who enters into a living inward connexion with the church of the Lord. The correctness of our interpretation appears, from a comparison of the remaining passages, where the design of the symbolic action is very evident. 1 Sam. 10: 1 sq. Samuel, after he has anointed Saul, says to him, "Of a truth the Lord has anointed thee to be a prince over his inheritance. — And there comes over thee, the Spirit of the Lord,— and thou wilt be changed into another man. Then do thou what thine hand will find; for the Lord is with thee." Here, where the anointing, and the imparting of the Spirit of the Lord, stand in the relation of cause and effect, what can be plainer, than that the former typifies what the latter imparts; that it is a seal and pledge of the good things which the Lord gives to the rulers of his people for the prosperity of the latter? In like manner, 16: 13, 14, where the anointing of David is mentioned: "And the Lord said, anoint him; and then Samuel took the oil-vessel, and anointed him, — *and so* fell the Spirit of the Lord upon David from that day forth. And the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord terrified him." From the New Testament we cite Mark 6: 13, "The apostles cast out many devils, and anointed many sick persons with oil, and made them whole in the name of the Lord." James 5: 14, "Is any sick, let him call the elders of the church; let them pray over him, and anoint him with oil, in the name of the Lord." On which latter place, Bengel remarks: "*Whitakerus: 'oleo utantur, qui possunt ægrotis sanitatem precibus impetrare: qui non possunt, abstinent inani symbolo.' Unus enim illius unctionis scopus initio erat* miraculosa *sanatio, qua deficiente non est nisi inane symbolum.*" The oil, therefore, is here also a symbol of the operations of the Spirit of God. We now proceed to those passages, where the anointing occurs as a mere figure. Ps. 45: 8, "Thou hast anointed him, thy king, with the oil of gladness," i. q. thou hast imparted to him the powers and gifts of thy Spirit. For that we are by no means, with several interpreters, to take this anointing with "the oil of gladness," as a mere designation of the imparting of joy, borrowed from the custom of anointing at feasts; that rather, by the oil, "the holy anointing oil" is to be understood, and "the oil of gladness" is that which brings joy with it; appears from a comparison of v. 9, with Exod. 30: 23, sq. On Is. 61: 1, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed

me," &c. Vitringa justly remarks, "*Id est in potestate vocis, ut notet eos, qui ungi dicuntur, censeri a deo ad hanc illam dignitatem sanctificatos, ad deum pertinere atque ab ipso eum in finem necessariis dotibus instructos esse, et quidem in œconomia ecclesiæ a spiritu dei. Unctio inferebat participationem spiritus sancti. Quanto autem officia sunt nobiliora, ad quæ quis ungitur, tanto majorem sp. s. copiam unctio affert.*" 1 Kings 19 : 15, sq., where Elijah receives the command to anoint Hazael as king over Aram, Jehu, as king over Israel, and Elisha, as a prophet; a symbolic action, and a symbol, are combined with one another in a remarkable manner, as a clear proof how little, in case of the former, depended upon the material. Jehu and Hazael were actually anointed; the latter, only in order to symbolize the divine power, which should be imparted to him as an instrument of the divine penal justice for the destruction of Israel. Of an anointing of the prophets, we find elsewhere no trace; and in reference to Elisha, therefore, must the anointing be regarded as a figurative designation of the imparting of the gifts of the Spirit. In the New Testament, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, as they are imparted to the true members of the church, the ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον καὶ βασίλειον (1 Pet. 2 : 5, 9.), are called directly χρίσμα 1 John 2 : 20, 27, and the anointing occurs Acts 4 : 27, 10 : 38, 2 Cor. 1 : 21, partly without an adjunct, partly with the addition πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, of an imparting of the gifts of the Spirit to Christ, and to believers. — In reference to the agreement between the figure and the reality, comp. Vitringa, on Is. 10 : 27.

What now is intended by the קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, to be consecrated and supplied with the gifts of the Spirit? Plainly "the new temple of the Lord," the Church of the new Covenant. That the temple, as the seat of the Theocracy under the old covenant, not unfrequently occurs as a designation of the church, we have already seen on Zech. 6 : 12. We will now cite some passages from the Psalms, which prove how general this more spiritual consideration of the temple was; where, disregarding the shell, only the kernel, the gracious presence of the Lord, was seen. Ps. 15 : 1, "Who shall dwell in thy tabernacle, who shall abide upon thy holy hill?" These words signify precisely, "Who belongs to the members of thy house, thy confidents, thy Spiritual Church?" A question, which the Psalmist was led to ask, by seeing a great mixed multitude assemble at the outward temple. Ps. 22 : 6, "My dwelling is in the house of the Lord for ever." The sense is here, by understanding the passage su-

perficially, entirely perverted. It is commonly supposed, that by the "dwelling in the house of the Lord," a residence in the outward temple is to be understood, without considering that the discourse cannot be of such a residence, but that a permanent condition is required by the parallelism. "To dwell in the house of the Lord," is here also, to enjoy his near presence and confidence; comp. Ps. 5: 5, "The ungodly dwells not with thee"; — Ps. 63: 4, "Thus do I behold thee in the sanctuary." By "the presence of the Lord," for which the Psalmist so ardently longs, the desolate wilderness is converted into the temple of the Lord. For, where God is, there is the sanctuary. Ps. 73: 17, "Until I go into the sanctuaries of the Lord," מִקְדְּשֵׁי אֵל, according to the constant usage, which can be relinquished with De Wette only from mere caprice, *the temple;* the plural, with reference to the threefold division of the same. With regard to the temple, however, the Psalmist thinks not of the shadow, but the substance, the presence of the Lord. To "come into the temple of the Lord," is to draw near to him, in order to draw from his rich fountain the knowledge, which, according to v. 16, carnal reason cannot give. Ps. 27: 4, "One thing do I desire of the Lord, only that do I seek, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the favor of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple." The Lord is the light and salvation of the Psalmist. Therefore, he has only one prayer, only one wish; that the Lord would remain with him, in whom every thing else is included; that he may never lose his favor or be excluded from his fellowship. That the outward temple, as such, is not here intended, is evident from v. 5, which is connected with this by כִּי. If there, the being concealed in the tabernacle, and in the tent of the Lord, is to be understood altogether figuratively, so must the gross literal understanding here also be entirely absurd. It is likewise only in the spiritual sense that אַחַת can be explained. It is one thing, which gives David courage against the whole world; it is one thing, therefore, only, which he desires and seeks; not a residence in the outward temple, but the possession of the mercy of the Lord. In addition to this, the false interpretation of לַחֲזוֹת בְּנֹעַם יְהוָה by "to behold the beauty of the Lord," is connected with the literal understanding, while נֹעַם יְהוָה never has any other meaning than "the grace, the mercy, of the Lord," and the equally erroneous interpretation of לְבַקֵּר בְּהֵיכָלוֹ by "and to view thy sanctuary with pleasure," while בקר never has the meaning, "to see." The object of the Psalmist's reflection, is the mercy

of the Lord, his exalted protector. The whole of the 84th Psalm, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts," can receive an easy and natural interpretation only by supposing that the temple is wherever God is. The absurdity of the literal understanding is especially evident in v. 4.

The prophet designates the new temple which should be anointed by the grace of the Lord, as "*a* holy of holies," in contrast with the former, only one particular part of which received this name. Just as Ezekiel, in the cited passage, for the same reason, described the whole compass of the hill, on which the new temple should be built, as a "holy of holies." The cited passages of the Pentateuch lie at the foundation of the figurative representation, in which the anointing of the outward temple is treated of. This outward anointing stands to that here described, in the relation of the type to the antitype. The anointing of a "holy of holies" stands in antithesis with the desolation of the sanctuary, and the destruction of the wing of abomination in v. 26, 27. The former sanctuary is destroyed, because it has become a mere shell without a kernel; because, through the guilt of the people, that which made it the sanctuary, the presence of the Lord, has departed from it; a new sanctuary, without a covering and shell; a new dwelling-place of God on earth, is consecrated. What gives to this interpretation the advantage over that of the person of the Messiah, besides this double reference, is as follows. 1. Although it neither can, nor should be denied, that the representation of the Messiah under the image of the true temple, is, in general, possible; still, it never occurs in the Old Testament; while the supposition, that the "holy of holies" signifies the church of the Lord, has a multitude of analogies in its favor. 2. By "the anointing of the Messiah," nothing else could be understood, than the imparting of the gifts of the Spirit for the execution of his office, as it is described Is. 11 : 1, and as it took place at his baptism. This, however, falls in the end of the 69th week. It relates to the remaining blessings promised in this verse, as the cause to its effect, and it must, therefore, be very surprising, if it is mentioned coördinately with them, nay, even in the last place; and the more so, as the ל repeated before each particular blessing, shows that they are not to be considered, in general, as being imparted during the period of the 70 weeks of years, but as existing in their full completion at the close of this period, while the anointing of the Messiah, as one particular action, not progressive, like the rest, would not reach this

terminus ad quem. That the sealing of sin also, &c., as effected by the death of the Messiah, would not reach this termination, need not be objected. Its objective completion falls, it is true, in the middle of the 70th week of years; the subjective, however, the imparting of the treasures of grace and forgiveness, procured by the Messiah, reaches its termination; as, in v. 27, the confirmation of the covenant for many, is described as extending through the whole 70th week. Even therewith, also, was the sealing of the vision first to be completed. For the prophets speak, throughout, not merely of the atonement as an objective transaction, but, at the same time, of the appropriation of the same by the covenant people.

Verse 25.

"And thou wilt know and understand, from the going forth of the word to restore, and to build Jerusalem, until an Anointed One, a Prince, are 7 weeks, and 2 and 60 weeks. The street will be restored and built, and it is firmly determined, and in times of distress."

"*And thou wilt know and understand.*"

That וְתֵדַע וְתַשְׂכֵּיל is not to be explained with most interpreters by, "mark well," but rather, as the Seventy (*καὶ γνώσῃ καὶ διανοηθήσῃ*) and Theodotion (*καὶ γνώσῃ καὶ συνήσεις*), the *fut.* must be taken in the sense of *fut.*, while the Vulg. (*scito ergo et animadverte*) has led the way to the false interpretation, which takes it in the imperative, we have already shown in the *Beiträgen*, I. p. 261. This mistake is refuted even by the form, which, only in exceptions which are seldom found, stands for the *imper.* and *optat.;* comp. Ewald, p. 527. About to impart to Daniel, by carrying out farther the picture which had only been sketched, a further disclosure concerning the future condition of his people, and thus to fulfil the design of his coming, announced v. 27, ("I am come to give thee insight,") Gabriel awakens attention by these introductory words, which indeed indirectly, at the same time, contain an admonition to attend, as the promise to give insight presupposes, that this is not attainable by human power, and that things would be treated of, respecting which, God only could make a disclosure. Finally, it is not to be overlooked, that "Thou wilt know and understand" expresses only the design of the teacher, and not the capacity of the scholar; that therefore, the

promise was only so far fulfilled as the latter allowed, and that, in the case of this prophecy also, there remained for Daniel no less darkness, than with respect to that, chap. 12, which the angel in v. 9 describes, as shut up even for him.

"*From the going forth of the word.*"

That מֹצָא דָבָר here signifies the emanation of a decree, as (2 : 13,) it is said of the command to slay the Magians, "it has gone forth," there can be no doubt. The farther designation by *word*, occurs elsewhere; also, e. g. 1 Sam. 15 : 23, 17 : 29, Esth. 4 : 3, where the discourse relates to command. The only question is, who must be regarded as the author of the command? By far the larger number of interpreters take a Persian king as such; we, however, assert, that only a going forth of the command from God, or from the heavenly council, can be intended, and indeed for the following reasons. 1. It is in the highest degree unnatural, that the word of an earthly ruler should be here designated by דָּבָר, without a single syllable being said of such a person in what precedes and follows, either directly or indirectly. Nothing is effected by an appeal to Dan. 2 : 13, and Esth. 4 : 3. For, in the first passage, he, from whom the command goes forth, as well as the command itself, is mentioned in the foregoing context, and in the second, ("in all places, where the word of the king and his command arrived,") the meaning is rendered definite in the verse itself. He, from whom the word here goes forth, must rather be the same, through whom all the fortunes of the covenant people, predicted throughout the prophecy, are determined, who has cut off the 70 weeks over his people, from whom the decree of the ruins of v. 26, and the final sentence in v. 27, proceed; and the more so, since, at the end of the verse (וְחָרוּץ), he is expressly mentioned as the person, by whom the decree for the rebuilding of the city was formed. 2. The expression יָצָא דָבָר is used, v. 23, of a divine decree; viz. that 70 weeks of years should be determined upon the people. Surely, no one could find it easy to suppose that here, where, because the discourse continues to relate to the transactions of Daniel with the heavenly messenger, the agent is expressed in a manner equally indefinite, another person is suddenly to be supplied as such.

But how can an invisible fact be placed as *terminus a quo*, since that must be perceptible by the senses, if the whole prophecy is not

to be illusory, if it is to be possible, after the fulfilment, to be convinced of its truth by chronological calculation? We answer, with God the difference in point of time between word and deed ceases. Word and execution are one with him. He commands, and it stands there. He speaks, and it is done. Ps. 33:9, Gen. chap. 1, Ps. 119:90, 91, 148:5, Is. 48:13. This coincidence of the word and deed is impressed even on the language. Thus the verb נָגַע, which of itself can signify only the verbal rebuke, and used of men designates only that, occurs, in respect to God, also of the *real chastisement*. Thus צִוָּה, *to command*, includes in itself also the execution of the divine commands. The appearance of the *terminus a quo* occurs, therefore, when the commencement of the execution of the divine command is seen. Petavius, who (l. 12. *De Doctr. Temp.*, c. 32. t. II. p. 262. ed. Antv.) remarks, "*Ego vocabulum* מוֹצָא *non solam arbitror edicti promulgationem, sed amplius aliquid esse, nempe id quod latina vox proprie significat, veram et seriam decreti illius executionem, ita ut mora omni impedimentoque sublato opus ipsum urgeri et Hierosolyma instaurari cœperit," as to the substance, was far more correct than his opposers, who have easily proved to him, that he took מוֹצָא in a false sense, comp. e. g. Frischmuth in the *Thesaur. Theol. Phil.* I. p. 912. He only erred by adopting the false supposition, that the discourse is here of the edict of a Persian king, and attributing to the import of the word, that which, according to a correct interpretation, follows from the nature of the acting subject.

"*To restore and to build Jerusalem.*"

As the *tirminus ad quem*, corresponding to the *terminus a quo* מִן־מוֹצָא, is designated by the following עַד, so is the לְ in לַמָּשִׁיחַ taken by most interpreters, not, as it usually stands in such a connexion (comp. e. g. Dan. 12:11), as a designation of a *terminus ad quem*, but of the object of the word, as e. g. 1 Sam. 19:1, "Saul spoke to slay, לְהָמִית, David." We may, however, very well take both לְ and עַד as a designation of the *term. od quem*, and then the first *term. ad quem* would serve at the same time as *term. a quo* for the second: from the going forth of the word (to restore Jerusalem), until the restoration of Jerusalem, (and from there,) until an anointed One, a Prince. Then the first of the two following dates, would designate the compass of the first period, from the command for the restoration of Jerusalem, till its execution. The second, the com-

pass of the second, from the finishing of the restoration, until the anointed One. An entirely similar union of two *termini ad quem*, of which the first serves again as *terminus a quo* to the second, is found e. g. Jer. 31 : 40, עַד־נַחַל קִדְרוֹן עַד־פִּנַּת שַׁעַר הַסּוּסִים, "to the brook Kedron (and from there) to the corner of the horse-gate." This interpretation is favored even by the following twofold determination of time, which leads us to expect, that in the foregoing also, where this twofold period of time is determined as to its beginning and end, its consisting of two parts would be mentioned. We need not object to this interpretation, that מִן־כֹּצֵא דָבָר would then stand too much apart. This is still more true of יָצָא דָבָר in v. 23. What the contents of the divine command which has gone forth may be, must there first be inferred from v. 24; viz. that 70 weeks are determined upon the city. Here the object is determined by what immediately follows. Precisely this agreement with v. 23, however, is an argument for the correctness of our interpretation. Nor may we urge the objection, that then עַד would rather be placed instead of לְ. The prepositions which of themselves designate a mere direction *whither*, are, in all languages, placed also where the motion proceeds until it reaches the object, without thereby losing their proper meaning. In Hebrew, such a use of לְ is so frequent, that it is scarcely worth the trouble to cite examples. Of returning to the Lord, שׁוּב לְ or אֶל, and שׁוּב עַד, are promiscuously used. In Zech. 14 : 10, מִגֶּבַע לְרִמּוֹן designates the whole extent of the holy land, from the one extreme boundary to the other. Here, however, there was a special reason for the choice of the לְ. The restoration of Jerusalem, if we consider the given period as a whole, forms merely a point of transition. In order to indicate this, עַד is placed before the absolute *terminus ad quem*.

הָשִׁיב has been misunderstood in various ways. 1. Several interpreters understand it of the bringing back of the people. But, apart from the violent ellipse which must be supposed, the reference of לָהָשִׁיב to Jerusalem is sufficiently plain from הָשִׁוב, which stands in close relation to it, which, like נִבְנְתָה, can be referred only to רְחוֹב, *street*. 2. Others, as Scaliger and Bertholdt, p. 651, explain, "to rebuild"; asserting that שׁוּב expresses, even in *Hiph.*, a mere repetition of a thing. But we need only look at the only proof-passage cited by them, to be convinced, that it affords no argument for an opinion, which deserves beforehand to be rejected. 2 Sam. 15 : 25, "And the king said to Zadok, *bring back* the ark of the covenant

to the city; if I shall find mercy in the eyes of the Lord, וְהֵשִׁיבָנִי, so will he *bring me back*, cause me to see it and its dwelling-place." הֵשִׁיב is here, as always, transitive: *to cause to return, to bring back.* But what is it now, "to cause a city to return, or, to bring back a city"? It designates its complete restitution into its former condition. This is shown, among other passages, by Ezek. 16:55, "And thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, will return to their former condition, תָּשֹׁבְנָה לְקַדְמָתָן, and Samaria and her daughters will return to their former condition, and thou and thy daughters will return into your former condition." Seventy, Ἀποκατασταθήσονται καθὼς ἦσαν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. It is said before, v. 53, "I turn the captivity, שָׁבְתִּי אֶת שְׁבוּת, of Sodom and her daughters," &c., a phrase, which never, as the interpreters for the most part falsely assume, imports the bringing back of captives, but always, and without exception, the *restitution to the former condition*, — שְׁבוּת, *captivity*, as a figurative designation of misfortune, — and here, even on account of the nature of the subject, and the last words of the verse, "and I turn the captivity of thy captives," must necessarily have this sense. In the passage before us, the *restitution to the former condition* receives, through the subjoined לִבְנוֹת, especial limitation. "To bring back and to build," &c., "bring back to build, or, building to bring back," to build up the city again in its ancient circumference, the same which Jeremiah (33:7) expresses by the words "to build as in the beginning." The importance of the farther definition by הֵשִׁיב, subjoined to "to build," sufficiently appears from the fact, that before נִבְנָתָה, תָּשׁוּב is afterwards repeated.

From this determination of the import of לְהָשִׁיב, we gain this important result: that we must not seek the *terminus a quo* of the 70 weeks of years, in the time of the first poor commencement of a rebuilding, but rather in that, when, according to the testimony of history, a work was commenced, which promised to restore the city nearly to its ancient condition, with respect to its extent and the beauty of its edifices. This supposition, which is hereby alone fully established, receives further confirmation from the following arguments. 1. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and thy holy city," seems to show, that the city, as well as the people, was in existence at the beginning of the 70 weeks of years; that, therefore, the beginning of the same cannot, in general, give the *terminus a quo*. 2. In the prediction of the destruction, in v. 26, as well as in v. 27, the temple is mentioned together with the city.

That it is not mentioned here, in the prediction of the rebuilding, that merely the building of the streets of the city is spoken of, presupposes the sanctuary, at the commencement of the building here treated of, as already built; since we cannot suppose, that the angel would have omitted that which was most important, on account of which Daniel had chiefly mourned and had most earnestly prayed, comp. e. g. v. 17 – 20; and, on the other hand, the existence of the temple requires, that the rebuilding of the city should have already commenced.

Several interpreters take בָּנָה here in the sense *to fortify*, and indeed בָּנָה עִיר often occurs in this sense, (comp. the proofs in Gesen. *Thes.*, and in *Winer*, s. v., and best in Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 190, and on Josh. 6 : 5, who points out this idiom also in the Syriac;) not as though the verb received a new meaning, but *ex materia subjecta*, partly because the building, in the case of a city already in existence, is necessarily limited to its fortification, as 2 Chron. 11 : 5, בָּנָה לְמָצוֹר, then, v. 6, בָּנָה simply, partly because the idea of a city, taken in its whole compass, includes its fortification. But that this meaning is not applicable here, sufficiently appears from what follows, "streets are built," where the internal part of the city is precisely designated, as that which was to be built. This interpretation is owing merely to the wish to be able to place the *terminus a quo* in the time of Nehemiah, the gratification of which was expected from this false interpretation of לְהָשִׁיב and תָּשׁוּב.

"*Until an Anointed One, a Prince.*"

Several recent interpreters, as Bertholdt and Hitzig, explain, "until *an*, or, until *the* Anointed Prince." This interpretation is, however, to be considered as decidedly ungrammatical. מָשִׁיחַ, as the older interpreters (comp. e. g. Vitringa in his excellent treatise, *De Seventy Hebdom. Dan., Observ. Sacrr.*, t. II. p. 290,) unanimously remark, cannot be regarded as an adjective, belonging to נָגִיד, because the adjective in Hebrew is placed after the substantive. This rule is entirely without exception. That passages like those cited by Bertholdt, p. 654, — e. g. 1 Chron. 28 : 5, כִּי רַבִּים בָּנִים נָתַן לִי יְהוָה, not "many children has the Lord given to me," &c., but "many are the children, which," &c., — are no exception; that in them the qualifying word does not belong to the noun as an adjective, but forms the predicate, is too obvious to require any

proof. But even the only two passages, which Ewald, p. 627, still regards as exceptions, and which are liable to suspicion, even on account of their being the only examples, appear on a closer examination, strictly to come within the rule. Jer. 16 : 16, is to be translated, "and afterwards will I send many others, huntsmen," with reference to the preceding, "Behold, I send many fishers, saith the Lord, and they fish them." Ps. 89 : 51, "all the many, yea, nations," so that we have a climax, "great multitudes, yea, whole nations."

Those now, who justly regard מָשִׁיחַ as a noun, and נָגִיד as in *apposition* with it, mostly take מָשִׁיחַ here as a sort of *proper name* of Christ, appealing to the absence of the article, and hence they derive an argument against the non-Messianic interpretation. If we look merely at מָשִׁיחַ, this interpretation is very plausible. That *Apellatives*, when they pass over into *proper names*, gradually lose the article, because the individual thereby designated as the only one of his kind needs not to be distinguished from others, is well known. Thus עֶלְיוֹן, spoken of God, often stands without the article. Numb. 24 : 16, Deut. 32 : 8, Ps. 21 : 8, 46 : 5. Thus the Messiah, as king *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, in comparison with whom all who are otherwise called kings are no kings, is named simply מֶלֶךְ, without the article, Ps. 45 : 1, 72 : 1. As צֶמַח, as a designation of the Messiah, occurs in Isaiah and Jeremiah appellatively, and with a more particular definition subjoined, and in Zechariah without this, and as a *proper name*, so also might מָשִׁיחַ, on the ground of Ps. 2, where it is found as an appellative designation of Christ, have become among the pious so current a designation of the Messiah, as to assume the nature of a proper name, and, as such, to stand in no need of being rendered more definite. This supposition is the less difficult, since at a later period this has undeniably occurred, in reference to מָשִׁיחַ; comp. e. g. John 4 : 25, where the Samaritan woman says, "I know *ὅτι Μεσσίας* (not *ὁ Μεσσίας*) *ἔρχεται, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*." But this interpretation, however just, if מָשִׁיחַ stood alone, appears as untenable, if we consider the subjoined נָגִיד. For as this word cannot also be regarded as a proper name, as it occurs (v. 26) as a designation of the heathen prince, so, if this interpretation were correct, it must have the article, *the* Messiah, *the* Prince, as e. g. we cannot say, דָּוִד נָגִיד, but only דָּוִד הַנָּגִיד. We must, therefore, translate, "an Anointed One, a Prince," and assume, that the prophet, in accordance with the uniform character of his prophecy, chose the more indefinite, instead

of the more definite designation, and spoke only of *an* Anointed One, *a* Prince, instead of *the* Anointed One, *the* Prince, κατ' ἐξοχήν, and left his hearers to draw a deeper knowledge respecting him, from the prevailing expectations, grounded on earlier prophecies of a future great King, from the remaining declarations of the context, and from the fulfilment, the coincidence of which with the prophecy must here be the more obvious, since an accurate date had been given.

That the reference to Christ is so manifest as to force itself upon even the most prejudiced, appears from the following remarkable confession of Bertholdt (l. c. p. 563): "That at the words משיח נגיד we should be led to think of the Messiah, Jesus, and at those v. 26, יכרת משיח ואין לו, of his crucifixion, though not absolutely necessary, is still very natural." We leave out of view for the present the confirmation, which this reference receives from the fulfilment, and unfold only the grounds, which were accessible to Daniel himself, and his contemporaries, on a deeper investigation. 1. The blessings predicted in the foregoing verse, the forgiveness of sin, the introduction of everlasting righteousness, &c., belong, as already mentioned, to the uniform characteristics of the Messianic time in the prophets. When now, in a representation which announces itself by "thou wilt know and understand" as a farther continuation of the contents of v. 24, the discourse relates to an exalted King, who should make his appearance after 69 weeks of years, and therefore shortly before the time in which the finished conferring of these blessings upon the covenant people was placed, how could it be thought otherwise, than that this King should be the author of these blessings, the Messiah, announced as such by all the prophets? 2. This connexion between the person and the imparting of the blessings, is farther especially indicated by the relation of the designation of the person as מָשִׁיחַ to the phrase לִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים. "By the Anointed One shall a holy of holies be anointed." Precisely in order, to make this reference prominent, is לִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים placed at the end, and מָשִׁיחַ before נָגִיד. 3. As נָגִיד does not exclude the reference to the Messiah, as it occurs of him Is. 55 : 4 (comp. *in loco*), so does מָשִׁיחַ, which here relates to נָגִיד as the special to the general, notwithstanding its indefiniteness decidedly point to him; like the corresponding שַׁר, Is. 9 : 6, מֹשֵׁל, Mic. 5 : 1, and נָשִׂיא, Ezek. 34 : 24. It serves more closely to designate נָגִיד as a Theocratic regent, just as 1 Sam. 10 : 1, ("And Samuel took the

oil vessel, and poured it upon his (Saul's) head and kissed him, and said, Of a truth the Lord hath anointed thee, as a prince over his inheritance," יְהוָה עַל־נַחֲלָתוֹ לְנָגִיד מְשָׁחֲךָ,) the anointing makes Saul not a regent in general, but a Theocratic regent, who, as God's representative, is furnished by him with the gifts necessary for his office. The assertion is entirely false, that every heathen king also could bear the name מָשִׁיחַ, *Anointed.* It is refuted, as well by the already established import of the symbol, and figure of anointing, as by the usage of the language. In all the books of the Old Testament, only one single heathen king (Cyrus, in Is. 45 : 1,) is called מָשִׁיחַ, and he not indeed as such, but on account of the remarkable relation, of which there is no other example in history, in which he stood to the theocracy, the rich gifts with which God endowed him for its benefit, the commencement of the true knowledge of God enjoyed by him, as exhibited in his edict in the book of Ezra, (comp. Kleinert, p. 138, sq.), and the typical relation, which he sustained to the author of the higher deliverance, the Messiah. Cyrus could, in a measure, be regarded as a theocratic prince, and as such he is represented in Isaiah. Comp. the striking remarks of Vitringa on Is. l. c. Only in connexion with this whole description, is he represented in Isaiah as an *anointed* of God, and it by no means follows from this passage, that he could be so called without such a connexion, and still less, that another heathen king could receive this name, who resembled him only in that which was not the ground of his being designated as מָשִׁיחַ. 4. The context furnishes us with still another proof, besides that which lies in the word itself, that not a heathen, but a Theocratic king is intended. This is found in the manifest antithesis between מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד and נָגִיד הַבָּא in v. 26. The general נָגִיד is common to both designations. In opposition to מָשִׁיחַ, as a special characteristic of the Theocratic king, stands הַבָּא, he who comes, *advena,* as a designation of a heathen prince. If then it is established, that by מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד only a Theocratic king can be designated, who else can he be than the Messiah, since the whole time after Daniel affords no other subject, since he is the only Theocratic king, whom the prophets living at the time of the exile and afterwards have predicted as future, and since, e. g., Ezekiel (21 : 32) expressly says, the insignia of the regal dignity should be taken away from Israel, until the appearance of the great object of promise?

If, then, by מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, Christ must be understood, the question

still arises, whether his birth, or the time when he was consecrated as מָשִׁיחַ by the anointing from above, is to be regarded as the *terminus ad quem*. The latter is the usual supposition of the Messianic interpreters: comp. *Petavius* l. c. *l.* 12, *c.* 33, *t. II.* p. 264: "69 *hebdomades desinunt in Christum ducem, non nascentem, sed in lucem apertumque prodeuntem, seque ad οἰκονομίαν et κήρυξιν accingentem, h. e. in baptismum ipsius, qui anno primo septuagesimæ hebdomadis incurrit.*" This view can be established by an irrefragable proof. After the course of 70 weeks shall the whole work of salvation, to be performed by the Messiah, be completed; after 69 weeks, and, indeed, as it appears from the more accurate determination in v. 27, in the middle of the 70th, he shall be cut off. As now, according to the passage before us, 69 weeks shall elapse before the Messiah, there remains from that event to the completion of salvation only a period of 7, until his violent death, of 3 and a half years; a certain proof, that עַד מָשִׁיחַ must refer not to his birth, but to the appearance of the Messiah as such, (comp. Peter, Acts 1 : 21; Luke 3 : 23,) who, indeed, before his baptism was not yet the Messiah, only Jesus, not the Christ.

"Are seven weeks and threescore and two weeks."

The prophet in what precedes, "from the going forth of the word for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, until an Anointed One, a Prince," had given one extreme *terminus ad quem*, the appearing of the Anointed One, and a *terminus medius*, forming a subdivision of this period, the restoration of Jerusalem. Accordingly he here designates the whole distance, "from the going forth of the word, until the Anointed One," by a twofold determination of time. 69 weeks in all, shall elapse. 7 until the completed restoration of the city, 62 from that time until the Anointed One, the Prince.

No man can deny to this interpretation, — as Theodotion has it, ἕως Χριστοῦ ἡγουμένου ἑβδομάδες ἑπτὰ, καὶ ἑβδομάδες ἑξήκοντα δύο, and also the Vulg., "*usque ad Christum ducem hebdomades septem et hebdomades* 62 *erunt*," while the text of the Seventy lies here in total confusion, and therefore cannot be used, — the advantage of being easy and natural. No one has ever been able to bring an objection against it, and this will be the more difficult hereafter, since, according to our interpretation of the words, "from the going forth," &c. the twofold division of the period is already contained in these words,

and, therefore, a twofold determination of the time must naturally be expected. As a plausible objection against our interpretation, only the Athnach under שָׁבֻעָה has been urged. This proves, according to Marsham, that the two periods must be separated, and the latter referred to what follows: "*ab exitu verbi usque ad Messiam ducem sunt hebdom. VII. Et hebdomadis* 62 *ædificabitur platea et fossa.*" But the proposition, which lies at the foundation of this assertion, that the Athnach must always stand in the verse, where we place the greatest point, is false. It not unfrequently stands, if the place of the greatest point is manifest of itself, in members of a sentence, which we distinguish by a lesser point, in order to avoid the connexion of those, which should be separated from each other. Thus it stands, e. g. in v. 2, under חֲמֻדוֹת, instead of חֲמֻדוֹת, according to the common usage; so, Ps. 36 : 8, under אָדָם, instead of אֱלֹהִים, comp. Ps. 84 : 3, Prov. 6 : 26. Here, however, the separation of the two periods was of greater importance, in order to indicate that the 7 and the 62 weeks were not a mere arbitrary division of one whole period, but that its own characteristic mark belongs to each of the two.

This view of Marsham's has been universally followed by the recent non-Messianic interpreters, but against it are the following objections. 1. This interpretation presupposes that by "the Anointed, the Prince," Cyrus is to be understood; an assumption against which the positive reasons deduced for the reference to the Messiah, are so many *negative arguments;* and hereafter, in the *pars elenchtica*, it will receive a special refutation. 2. If the second determination of time is referred to what follows, we shall be obliged to interpret, "during 62 weeks, the streets will return and be built." But we thus obtain a highly absurd sense. For how can the restoration of the streets, which, according to the testimony of history, followed in a much shorter time, be designated as extending through a period of 434 years? This consideration is the more important for our opponents, since they maintain a prophecy after the event. This difficulty is acknowledged by them to be such, when they resort to an interpretation, which does violence to the language, in order to remove it; so that the proof of the untenableness of this interpretation becomes at the same time a confession of its authors, that their whole view of the prophecy is erroneous. They assert, (comp., e. g., Bertholdt, p. 657,) that the words וְשִׁבְעִים שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם stand in the *Accus.*, which very often indicates the time *in*, or *within* which, any thing happens; so that we must explain, "within 62 weeks." But it is evi-

dent that the rule of Ewald, p. 591, — "the accusative is used if the action belongs to the whole period of time. But if it is intended to show that the action falls in a definite point of a larger period, בְּ, *in*, must be placed, as the ablative in Latin," — in the case of larger periods of time is entirely without exception, and, indeed, that it never ceases, as Ewald asserts, to operate when the speaker does not give the definite point. From the passage, Gen. 14 : 4, וּשְׁלשׁ־עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה, which is commonly explained, "*in* the thirteenth year," Ewald (p. 592,) has already freed us by the remark, that we must rather interpret, "*through* the whole thirteenth year." The most plausible passage is Jer. 28 : 16, הַשָּׁנָה אַתָּה מֵת, *this year thou shalt die.* But it soon appears that הַשָּׁנָה here belongs to the comparatively few nouns of measure, of time, &c., which have become adverbs by frequent use, (comp. Ewald, p. 631,) entirely corresponding to נֶקֶר, פֶּתַח, בַּיִת, הַיּוֹם, הַלַּיְלָה עֶרֶב. The word הַשָּׁנָה, in the sense *in this year*, not, as Is. 37 : 30, "throughout this year," is so much of an adverb that it can never be followed by the *pron. demonstr.*; we cannot say הַשָּׁנָה הַהִיא, but only, as in Jer. 28 : 17 (as it follows immediately after הַשָּׁנָה), בַּשָּׁנָה הַהִיא. To these nouns, partaking of the nature of the adverb, belongs also הַבָּאִים, properly those, who are future, then in future, Is. 27 : 6. In like manner we also might well say, "this day, this hour, this week," for "within this week," &c., but not, "these seventy years," in any other sense, than during this whole period. There now remains for our opponents only one way of escape, to consider שָׁבֻעִים שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם as standing in the *nom. absol.*, "and with respect to the 62 weeks, so will the street be restored," &c.; but this also is inadmissible, for then in the sentence, "the street," &c., there must be a *suff.* referring to the 62 weeks; comp. Gesen. *Lehrg.* p. 723.

Ch. B. Michaelis, although faithful to the Messianic interpretation, has in like manner been led, by a false view of the Athnach, to connect the 62 weeks immediately with what follows: "until the Messiah are 7 weeks, and in 2 and 60 weeks will the city be rebuilt; and, indeed in the time of distress." The restoration of the city is the common characteristic of both periods; the latter is especially distinguished by, "in a time of distress." This interpretation avoids only the former of the difficulties, which oppose the preceding, the second remains in full force, and its weight is strengthened by other considerations. There can be no doubt, that every interpretation is false, which gives to the two periods, that of 7 weeks and that of 62 weeks, a common characteristic mark, and, therefore,

assumes that the prophet might as well have written 69, instead of 7 and 62. This is, in general, contrary to the character of the whole prophecy, in which there is nothing superfluous, no word without meaning; and it is, moreover, especially refuted by the analogy of all the remaining determinations of time, which it contains. To each of the other periods a definite event is assigned, which is completely to take place at its termination; to the 70 weeks, the finished introduction of everlasting righteousness, and the forgiveness of sin; to the 62, the appearing of the Messiah; to the whole 70th week, the finished confirmation of the covenant; to the first half of the same, the abolition of sacrifice. It is true that Michaelis attributes in a measure to the 7 weeks a *special characteristic*, the building of the city in a *prosperous time;* but this character is by no means, as in the case of all the other periods of time, expressly contained in the text, but must be skilfully inferred only from the antithesis with *in time of distress*, and, moreover, such a contrast between the two periods has no foundation in history. The first 7 weeks also bear the character of a time of distress, as the prophecies of Malachi, which belong to it, sufficiently prove; the favors of certain Persian kings do not argue *against*, but *for* this character; since to be dependent on foreign favor, is, for a people who have been free for a century, surely a sign of a distressing time, and then these favors were confined to very narrow limits. To the second period, on the contrary, belong the victories of the Maccabees, and the new national independence of the people, so that the marks must be exactly reversed.

"A street is restored and built."

That these words relate to the first of the two periods before mentioned is already sufficiently clear, if, with most interpreters, we consider וְלִבְנוֹת לְהָשִׁיב as an object of the command. For since each one of the two periods must necessarily have a definite sign, and since, for the second, the appearing of the Messiah had already been given as such, what remains for the first, but the finished execution of the command, which makes the *terminus a quo* for the whole period of the 69 weeks? Here, therefore, that only is expressly given, which might be inferred already from what precedes, and there is less room for indefiniteness, since in v. 26 that is carried forward, which had been said concerning the sign of the second

period, so that the expression, "the 2 and 60 weeks," sufficiently indicates that the foregoing belongs to the 7 weeks. The last vestige of uncertainty, however, vanishes, when the ל in לְהָשִׁיב is understood as a designation of the first *terminus ad quem*, for then the finished rebuilding of the city, in what precedes, is already expressly given as a mark of the first period; and its repetition here, as such, serves only to strengthen faith in what was incredible for those who beheld the ruins of Jerusalem, and especially to subjoin the two determinations, that it is firmly and irrevocably settled, and that it would come to pass in a time of distress.

That תָּשׁוּב here is not to be adverbially understood with several interpreters, but imports a return to the former condition, appears from the relation to the foregoing לְהָשִׁיב; and that רְחוֹב has the former of the only two meanings in general belonging to the verb, *street* and *public place*, — the others, which have been assumed as resting entirely on caprice, do not deserve to be mentioned, — is evident from its connexion with *to build*. For that we cannot take בָּנָה with Hassencamp, in a figurative sense, *to restore*, sufficiently appears from the reference to the preceding לִבְנוֹת, which can be taken only in a proper sense. We must also reject the interpretation of Cocceius (*Lex.* 805), "*ædificabitur quoad forum.*" For, although this construction not unfrequently occurs, (comp. e. g. Is. 1 : 30, Jer. 41 : 5, Ewald, p. 545), still there is here no ground to assume it, since רְחוֹב is usually *fem.*, and it requires that Jerusalem, or the city, which had not immediately preceded, should be supplied. רְחוֹב stands in the singular, and without the article, to designate the object according to its widest extent.

"And firmly is it determined, and in a time of distress."

With singular unanimity in error, the interpreters, with the exception of Hitzig, after the ancient translators, who plainly sought merely to conjecture the meaning from the collocation with רְחוֹב, (the Seventy καὶ ἀνοικοδομηθήσεται εἰς πλᾶτος καὶ μῆκος; Theodotius πλατεῖα καὶ τεῖχος. Vulg. *platea et muri*,) refer וְחָרוּץ to the preceding. Those among the recent interpreters, who do not, like Jahn, — who derives from the context, the sense, *a narrower street*, — follow this caprice, compare for the most part the Chald. חריץ to which they attribute the meaning, *trench*. On the contrary, however, Michaelis has already remarked, (*Suppl.* p. 951,) that חריץ never

has the sense *ditch*, but *aqueduct*, and that Jerusalem, on account of its position, scarcely needed a ditch. But it is entirely decided that a ditch can be no object of the verb *to build*, and that, in any event, the Chaldee could be appealed to, only when חָרַץ in the Hebrew did not occur in any suitable sense. Hassencamp (l. c. p. 66, ff.) adheres to the Hebrew idiom, and endeavours to give to חָרוּץ, the sense, *place of judgment*, though in vain, since the word does not admit of this either in respect to form or sense, and since also "to build" refutes this interpretation. Still, he deserves the credit of bringing back attention to the Hebrew idiom. According to this, וְחָרוּץ can mean nothing else than, "it is cut off," "firmly decreed," and must therefore be separated from what precedes. The sense of the root חָרַץ, has been admirably developed by Schultens, on Prov. 22 : 5. The ground meaning is that of *præcidere, decidere;* from this is derived that of accurate, precise determination and decision. In the latter it occurs e. g. 1 Kings 20 : 40, "so is thy judgment," אַתָּה חָרַצְתָּה, *tu decidisti, secante velut acie.* The *part. pass.* חָרוּץ has the meaning, *firmly determined*, Job 14 : 5, אִם חֲרוּצִים יָמָיו, "when his (man's) days are cut off"; and Is. 10 : 23, כִּלָּיוֹן חָרוּץ, "a completion is cut off, determined by an irrevocable sentence." Joel 4 : 14, עֲמֶק הֶחָרוּץ stands twice as the assembling-place of the multitudes of the people, where the day of the Lord shall be held, and the comparison of v. 2 and 12, where the same place, designated as "the valley of Jehoshaphat, of the judgment of the Lord," shows that we must not, with Credner, interpret "valley of threshing sledge," but like the Seventy (τῆς δίκης), "valley of judgment," of the *sententia præcisa et absoluta.* Every doubt of the employment of this idiom in the passage before us is removed by the occurrence of חָרַץ in this prophecy twice more in the sense, "to cut off," firmly and irrevocably to determine.

חָרוּץ and בְּצוֹק הָעִתִּים obviate every temptation, which could disquiet the pious Israelites. Present appearances afforded but a small prospect of a return, and much less of a restoration of the city in its ancient extent. After the return actually took place, a whole series of years elapsed in which the circumstances gave no hope of the restoration of the city, instead of which the Jews were obliged to content themselves with an open place of comparatively small compass. What was more natural than the supposition, that the promise of the Lord had been only conditional, that it had been rendered inoperative by the sins of the people? This opinion the

prophet guards against by the consoling וְחָרוּץ. Another temptation must arise from the fact, that even when this promise was already fulfilled, the circumstances of the people were any thing but prosperous. Hence, doubts of the Omnipotence of God might easily arise, as we see them, e. g., so strongly exhibited in the discourses of the ungodly in Malachi. In opposition to this temptation, וּבָצוֹק הָעִתִּים afforded the proof that the times of distress would not take place without the knowledge and will of God, that it was not perhaps something forced upon him by another, but foreseen and predestinated by himself.

Only one difficulty rests upon this interpretation, that it apparently makes, "in distress of the times," stand for, "in a destitute time will this decree be executed." This very harsh brevity, which we are obliged to assume, as long as we refer חָרוּץ to a decree of God already formed, is, however, avoided, as soon as we assume that the decree is here only predicted, and is not made until the beginning of its execution. This interpretation, philologically necessary, according to which the decree itself falls "in the times of distress," not it *is* determined, but it *becomes* determined, serves also, at the same time, to confirm our understanding of מִן מֹצָא דָבָר, which accurately corresponds to חָרוּץ.

Verse 26.

"And after the 62 weeks shall be extirminated an Anointed One, and is not to him, and the city, and the sanctuary, a people of a Prince, which is to come shall lay waste, and it will end in the flood, and until the end is war, a decree of the ruins."

"*And after the* 62 *weeks will an Anointed One be cut off.*"

As the characteristic mark of the 7 weeks had already been given, the prophet now proceeds to a further illustration of what concerns the כָּשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, whose manifestation he had, in v. 25, placed in the end of the 62 weeks, following the 7 weeks.

נִכְרַת, without a further addition like that in the frequent phrases נִכְרַת מֵעַמּוֹ, or בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל נִכְרַת, &c. designates, without exception, a violent mode of death. Thus, Zech. 13 : 8, 9, it stands opposed to גוע, as a designation of death by the sword, while the latter imports that by hunger and pestilence; comp. 1 Kings 11 : 6. Thus is it the

standing expression for the ruin of the ungodly, comp., e. g., Ps. 37 : 9, Prov. 2 : 22, which, in order to render a supernatural cause more manifest, is constantly represented as violent and sudden.

וְאֵין לוֹ, in accordance with the whole character of the prophecy, is intentionally left indefinite, without the article indicating its identity with the מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד. This could the more readily happen, since the careful and unprejudiced reader could easily determine this point from the context. As מָשִׁיחַ of itself implied a king of Israel, as this designation was made still clearer by the following contrast with a Prince, who was to come, so must the reader be led at once to think of the Messiah, because prophecy knows no other king of Israel after the exile. At the end of the 69 weeks should the מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד appear. Who other than he could now well be thought of, when here, in the further prosecution of the subject, the violent death of an Anointed One is announced, to take place after the completion of the 7 and the 62 weeks? The death of the Anointed One is placed in the verse before us in a causal connexion with the desolation of the city and the temple, in like manner as, v. 25, is his appearance with the imparting of all the blessings which had been promised in v. 24. How could one fail to perceive, that cursing and blessing, as they fall in the same period, belong also to the same author, that the former was the consequence of the violent slaying, here predicted of the same Anointed One, who should bestow the fulness of the blessing, and has actually bestowed it, upon those who have received him, and allowed themselves, through him, to confirm the covenant? And indeed the more so, since the violent death of the Messiah had already, before the time of Daniel, been predicted by Isaiah, chap. 53, where (v. 8,) the entirely corresponding expression occurs, "he has been cut off from the land of the living," and after him, by Zech. 12 : 10. After the fulfilment, all uncertainty, since the calculation of the years might readily remove it, has been rendered perfectly inexcusable.

"*And is not to him.*"

The different interpretations of these words fall under two classes. Those, in which an attempt is made to give them a meaning, without assuming an ellipsis, and those in which such an assumption is made. We will consider the former class first. We oppose to them *all*, the thesis, "that אֵין has never any other meaning than *non-*

existence, and *it is not*; אֵין only the latter." It is, therefore, entirely impossible, without the assumption of an ellipsis, to make the words bear any tolerable sense.

1. Very widely diffused among the older theologians is the interpretation, "*et non sibi*." Vitringa, l. c. p. 258: "*Non adeo sui, quam aliorum causa, electorum nimirum et credentium, qui fructu mortis ipsius gavisuri sunt.*" It has been lately defended in Tholuck's *Litt. Anz.* Jahrg. 1830, p. 274. It is however to be rejected, for the simple reason that אֵין is never, either in the earlier or later usage, confounded with לֹא, but always distinguished from it in such a manner, that לֹא is a mere negation, אֵין denies existence. This will readily appear on a nearer examination of all the passages, which Gesenius, in the *Lehrg.*, p. 830, and in the *Thes.* s. v. has cited in favor of this permutation of אֵין with לֹא. Exod. 3 : 2, וְהַסְּנֶה אֵינֶנּוּ אֻכָּל, we cannot here suppose such a permutation on account of the *suff.* For how could a mere negation have a *suff.*? אֻכָּל is not *Præt.* but *Partic.* in *Pü.* without מ, which is most frequently wanting in precisely this Conj.; comp. Ewald, p. 254. Jer. 38 : 5, כִּי־אֵין הַמֶּלֶךְ יוּכַל אֶתְכֶם דָּבָר is not to be explained, "for the king cannot avail any thing against you"; but rather, following the accents, with Kimchi, Cocceius, Michaelis, "*non est rex is, qui possit apud vos vel contra vos quidquam*," which gives a much stronger sense, renders more prominent the feebleness of the king, and is also favored by the position of the words, "for the king is *not* he," which intimates a contrast of that which is, with that which, according to the nature of the case, ought to be. Job 35 : 15, וְעַתָּה כִּי־אַיִן פָּקַד אַפּוֹ is not to be translated "*sed nunc cum non animadvertat ira ejus*," and the less so, because here the *Stat. absol.* אַיִן stands, but rather, "and now, because it is not, his anger visits, and he cares not much for pride;" "because it is not," i. e. patient waiting for him, to which the speaker exhorts in the foregoing verses, which he had represented as the duty of Job. Cocceius: "*Homo in examen venit, ut probetur ejus spes et patientia. Quando illa non exstat, invadit ira ejus, qua odit et amolitur peccatum, etiam in iis, quos salvos vult.*" Ps. 135 : 17, and 1 Sam. 21 : 9, the idea of existence already contained in אַיִן, is made still more prominent by יֵשׁ, entirely analogous to the usual method of giving intensity to the verbal idea, by placing the *Infin. absol.* before the finite tense of the same verb; אַף אֵין־יֵשׁ־רוּחַ בְּפִיהֶם is, e. g., הָיֹה לֹא תִהְיֶה, &c.: "there is surely no breath in their mouth;" the וְאֵין (comp. on this

Ewald, p. 408,) יֶשׁ־פֹּה תַּחַת־יָדְךָ חֲנִית, "hast thou then *absolutely* no spear." To this philological argument, which is of itself decisive, must be added the unsuitableness of the sense. For who is cut off for his own good? It would be entirely different if לוֹ could signify, "for his own sake." For then would the death, which he deserved on his own account, be contrasted with that endured for the guilt of others, and we might justly compare Is. 53, where this thought is so strongly exhibited. 2. Others explain; "and nothing is to him." So Cocceius: *discipuli dispergentur,* — *cinget eum cœtus maleficorum.* Gousset, *omnia ei desunt.* But the meaning, *nothing*, however current in the lexicons and commentaries, is falsely attributed to אַיִן and אַיִן. It does not deny the *quiddity*, but the being. Whoever would become instructed in the difference between them, stamped upon all languages, will find satisfaction in the metaphysics of Aristotle. We will here also examine in order the passages, which are commonly cited in proof of the abovementioned fictitious meaning. Is. 41 : 24, חִדְאַתֶּם כְּאַיִן, not, "ye are less than nothing," but "ye are less than non-existence, as if ye were not;" 40 : 17, כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם כְּאַיִן, נֶגְדּוֹ, not, "all nations are as nothing," but "they are as non-existence, as not existing, before him." Ps. 39 : 6, חֶלְדִּי כָאַיִן נֶגְדֶּךָ, "my life is as non-existence before thee." Hagg. 2 : 3, in reference to the new temple, which was altogether diminutive in comparison with the former: הֲלוֹא כָמֹהוּ כְּאַיִן בְּעֵינֵיכֶם. Far more correct than the modern interpreters, Jerome: "*Non talis est ista, quæ cernitur, ut quodam modo non esse videatur?*" Is it not, as if it were not? Exod. 22 : 2, "He shall restore it (the thief that which was stolen); אִם אַיִן לוֹ, so shall he be sold, to restore that which was stolen, to make compensation." Here, that which is to be supplied, is evident from the context. When there is not to him, that whereof he can make restitution. 2 Chron. 5 : 10, אֵין בָּאָרוֹן רַק שְׁנֵי הַלֻּחוֹת. The words אֵין בָּאָרוֹן could here, standing alone, as little mean, "there was nothing in the ark," as could לֹא הָיָה. The ellipsis, the *something else*, is supplied by the contrast. Precisely so, 2 Kings 17 : 18, לֹא נִשְׁאַר רַק שֵׁבֶט יְהוּדָה לְבַדּוֹ. From this passage we might conclude, that לֹא means *nothing*, with the same right as from the foregoing that אֵין has this meaning. Ps. 19 : 7, אֵין נִסְתָּר is plainly not to be explained with Gesenius, "there is nothing concealed," but "there exists not a thing concealed." Exod. 8 : 6; אֵין כַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, Gesenius explains, "*nihil est sicut Jehovah deus noster.*" But that which is to be supplied after "there is not as the Lord our God," is suffi-

ciently determined by the antithesis. *Nothing*, is by no means suitable, since the God of Israel is designed to be especially compared with the idols of other nations; comp. 9 : 14. — אַיִן accordingly means *nothing*, just as little as יֵשׁ *something*. It is scarcely conceivable how this error could have gained such general currency. To whom did it ever occur, to assert that in Arabic ليس may mean also, by way of permutation, "there is nothing"? Who would venture to remark, that in English, we often use *to be* and *not to be*, for *something* and *nothing*? 3. Others, as L'Empereur (*Ad Jacchiad.* p. 191), and lately Sack (*Apol.* p. 288) and Hitzig, explain, "and no one is to him." But that אַיִן could ever mean *no one is*, or *no one*, is as great an error as the one just refuted. אַיִן serves as a paraphrase of *no man*, *no one*, only when the person is afterwards mentioned; e. g. "it is not one, who terrifies," אַיִן מַחֲרִיד. From this it does not follow, that אַיִן could mean, "there is no one." The *one* lies here in the word מַחֲרִיד. So all the examples in Gesenius. 1 Sam. 9 : 4, "they went through the land Schalaim, וְאָיִן, and were not;" not "no one was." The subject, the she asses, is left out for the sake of brevity, just as the object is in the preceding and following דִּלְא מָצְאוּ. This, however, can be done only when, as there, the subject or object has been already designated, — what they found not, could be nothing else than what the writer had previously designated as the object of their search, — the she asses. The example, therefore, has no application to the passages before us. Had the prophet wished to express the sense assumed in this explanation, he would have written אֶחָד after אַיִן, just as, 10 : 21, וְאֵין אֶחָד מִתְחַזֵּק עִמִּי. 4. Ch. B. Michaelis and Sostmann explain: "*non erit sibi, non amplius inter viventes reperietur.*" But אַיִן never includes the person; it does not mean, "*he* is not," but "*it* is not." Should this sense be allowed, instead of אַיִן, as in the passages which are cited as parallel, like Gen. 5 : 24, אֵינֶנּוּ must necessarily stand. And, moreover, the reference of an action or a passion to the dative pronoun, intimating the subject, is suitable only where the discourse has a predominant subjective character, comp. e. g. Ezek. 37 : 11; but not here, where directly the opposite is the case.

It is therefore certain, that the words are not complete in themselves, and that something must be supplied. This was seen by all the ancient translators without exception. In none of them do we find either of the four abovementioned false interpretations of אַיִן. They differ from each other, only either like Aquila (ἐξολοθρευθήσε-

ται ἠλειμμένος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ,) and Symm. (ἐκκοπήσεται Χριστὸς καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρξει αὐτῷ,) and the Syriac, in imitating the indefiniteness of the text, or, like the Seventy and the Vulg., in supplying the ellipsis in the translation.

It is therefore self-evident, that what is to be supplied should be taken only from what immediately precedes, and that all interpretations, in which this is not done, are entirely capricious, and cannot receive our concurrence. In this respect Bertholdt has the most widely erred by his, "he will have no successor out of his family." The lot of those is truly to be lamented, who, occupying themselves with the explanation of Scripture, impart such capricious views. Their employment is mere guess-work, which can never be certain whether it has hit upon that which is correct. More tolerable is the explanation of numerous interpreters "there is to him no helper," because what is then to be supplied is of wider extent, and therefore easier to be conjectured. This is true also, for another reason, of the explanation of several after the Seventy, "*judicium non erit ei, i. e. crimen quod judicium promeruit*," because there is some ground for the suspicion of what is to be supplied, in "he shall be cut off," which not unfrequently occurs of the punishment of evil doers.

If we seek to supply that which is wanting out of the foregoing, it must be something which belongs to the anointed, as such. As "he will be cut off" expresses the extinction of his personal existence, so must "and is not to him" express the extinction of his possession, and that not an accidental one, but that which constitutes his essential characteristic. What this is, in respect to an Anointed One, a Prince, cannot in itself be doubtful, and appears plainly enough from Ezek. 21 : 32; עַד בֹּא אֲשֶׁר לוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט וּנְתַתִּיו, "until He comes, to whom the judgment (the dominion) is, and I give it to him." That the dominion is to him, is here the characteristic of the Messiah, as King. 1 Sam. 10 : 1; Samuel says to Saul, "The Lord has anointed thee over his inheritance for a Prince." The characteristic mark of an anointed one was, therefore, to be a Prince over God's inheritance, over Israel. This mark vanished, the dominion of the anointed over his people was destroyed, when by their crime he was violently put to death. As to the sense, therefore, the Vulgate is entirely correct: "*et non erit ejus populus, qui eum negaturus est.*" And Jahn errs only in supplying the unnatural עַם, *people*. The correctness of the above interpretation is strikingly confirmed by what follows. With the negative

consequence of the cutting off of the Messiah, the cessation of his dominion over the covenant people, the positive, the desolation of the city and sanctuary by people of a prince, who should come, is well connected; just as in Zech., chap. 11, after the Messiah, hindered in the execution of the pastoral office by the resistance of the people, has relinquished it and broken his shepherd's staff, the poor flock is given up without rescue to the greatest misery, and the whole land is overflowed with enemies, who have hitherto been restrained only by the invisible power of the good Shepherd and King.

"*And the city and the sanctuary, people of a Prince, who comes, will lay waste.*"

Several interpreters, as J. D. Michaelis and Jahn, have supposed, that by נָגִיד here the same is to be understood, who had before been called מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד and מָשִׁיחַ, appealing to the fact, that the destruction of Jerusalem in the New Testament is commonly attributed to Christ. But that this is erroneous, that by נָגִיד rather a heathen, and, as the result showed, a Roman Prince, and by "people," not indeed, as it is commonly translated, "*the* people," his host, is designated, appears from the following reasons. 1. Even the bare נָגִיד, while the Messiah had been designated by מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, and מָשִׁיחַ, leads to an antithesis, and does not allow us to think of any other than a Gentile Prince. 2. This antithesis is expressed as plainly as possible by הַבָּא subjoined to נָגִיד, which serves as directly to render more definite this נָגִיד, as one who was to come from without, as מָשִׁיחַ serves this purpose, in reference to the former. This use of הַבָּא, to express a stricter definition and a contrast, is proved by its grammatical relation to נָגִיד, as in the case of the Messiah, the grammatical connexion of the two names מָשִׁיחַ and נָגִיד, the position of the former, before the latter, which is afterwards used alone, clearly expresses the same purpose. We must not, as is commonly done, translate נָגִיד הַבָּא, "of a coming Prince," but rather, "of a Prince, who comes." The article forbids us to join הַבָּא, as an adjective, with נָגִיד. As the rule, that a noun rendered definite by an article cannot take an indefinite adjective, is entirely without exception; so also is the rule, that no indefinite noun can be joined with a definite adjective. It is true, that even Ewald (p. 626) asserts, that such an anomaly is sometimes found in later books; but the examples cited in its favor all belong to that class, which he designates in the note,

probably subjoined at a later period, as a different one: "when the substantive is actually undetermined, the adjective renders distinctly prominent a class, Ps. 104: 18, 'mountains, the high.' The adjective has then the sense, 'which is.'" This is so very evident (who does not see, e. g., that (Zech. 4: 7,) הַר הַגָּדוֹל is not to be translated "the great mountain," but "mountain, thou great," which is far more emphatic than the former?) as to need no farther proof. "A Prince, who comes," accordingly alludes to another prince, who was already present, to a native king, and as such, the Messiah had been previously mentioned. בּוֹא is in Daniel, particularly in chap. 11, (comp. e. g. v. 13, 16, 21, 40, 41,) the standing, constantly recurring expression for a journey to a foreign land in general, and especially for the foreign expeditions of conquering kings.

Several interpreters join הַבָּא not to נָגִיד, but to עַם, "people of a Prince, that come." But this interpretation is refuted by the circumstance, that הַבָּא is plainly designed to distinguish the person of a certain prince, from that of another. In respect to the people, such a distinction, which the article in הַבָּא shows to have been intended, would be entirely inadmissible, since in the whole prophecy (the omission of the article shows that עַם has the sense, *people*, according to the connexion, *warriors*,) there is nothing said of a domestic host.

"And it will end in the flood."

The question arises, to what the *suff.* in קִצּוֹ is to be referred. Several recent interpreters suppose, to the heathen prince. But this supposition is, according to both its modifications, to be rejected. The one, "*Devastatio, quam populus ille venturus exercebit, tanta erit, quanta devastatio, quam inundatio efficit, i. e. maxima*," is liable to the objection, that קִצּוֹ in general cannot be understood actively, and, particularly in Daniel, is used only to signify the end which any one suffers; comp. 11: 45. The other, according to which the end of the Prince himself is here predicted, has the whole context against it; since, in what follows, the description of the desolations is carried forward, which are to proceed from this same Prince, whose destruction is here supposed to be foretold, and since the following קֵץ, which stands in manifest relation to קִצּוֹ, refers to the covenant people, and the holy land; but of an overthrow of the

conqueror, there is not, in what follows, the slightest trace; so that, referred to him, the words would seem to have been placed in the text at random.

By far the greatest number of interpreters refer the *suff.* to that, whose devastation and entire desolation is predicted in what precedes and follows. These, however, differ from each other in its grammatical interpretation. Several, as Geier, refer the *suff.* to the city and temple, where, however, we should rather expect the plural. Others, as Sostmann, merely to the temple, though we cannot see, why this only should be made prominent, since in what precedes, and immediately follows, both city and temple are, at the same time, the subject of discourse. The correct view was taken by Vitringa and Ch. B. Michaelis: "*Et finis ejus rei, quod nempe urbem ac templum populus ducis venturi sit vastaturus.*" Examples of a similar reference of the *suff.*, — no less than of the *pron. sep.*, comp. e. g. the הוּא, in reference to a whole preceding proposition, Zech. 11 : 11, Jer. 32 : 6 – 8, — not to a definite preceding noun, but to the subject itself, are not unfrequent, e. g. Ezek. 18 : 26, "When the righteous turns away from his righteousness, and doeth iniquity, and dies, עֲלֵיהֶם, on that account," viz. because he has forsaken righteousness, and practised unrighteousness. Is. 64 : 4; "Behold, thou art wroth, for we have sinned; בָּהֶם עוֹלָם, in them," the sin and the anger, "are we now already an eternity." Prov. 14 : 13, אַחֲרִיתָהּ, *finis ejus rei*, viz. when any one laughs. In Ps. 81, so greatly misunderstood by recent interpreters, on account of its exclusive reference to the passover, it is said, v. 26, "for a testimony in Israel, has he placed it," the celebration of his festival with the praise and thanksgiving recommended in what precedes, שָׂמוֹ; comp. other examples, as Exod. 10 : 11, Josh. 2 : 4, in Ewald, p. 645.

The ב in בְּשֶׁטֶף is taken by several as the so called *Beth essentiæ*: "his end will be an overflowing." Were it בְּשֶׁטֶף, this interpretation might, in the main, be justified, although the so called *Beth essentiæ*, as it is commonly understood, is a mere fiction of the grammarians. בְּ often stands when the relation of the particular to the general is to be indicated, since, as a part, it belongs to its whole. So, e. g., Ps. 39 : 7, "Only in the shadow, בְּצֶלֶם, does man walk." The walking of man belongs to the general category of the shadow. Ps. 42 : 11; "In a murder, בְּרֶצַח, in my bones mine enemies reproach me." The genus for the species. The reproach is the murder in the bones, the murder which pierces to

the inmost bones. Ps. 78 : 55; "He caused them to fall, בְּהֶבֶל נַחֲלָה, as an inheritance." And thus קִצּוֹ בְּשֶׁטֶף would mean, "the end of the desolation" belongs to the general category of the overflowing. Michaelis: "*Vastatio illa circa extrema instar diluvii erit, ita ut ruinis omnia obruat, quemadmodum inundatio longe lateque grassans, quidquid ei obviam erit, populatur ac sternit.*" But this whole view is completely disproved by the article in בַּשֶּׁטֶף, which has been strangely overlooked by interpreters. This shows, that the subject of discourse is one particular and definite flood, and indeed, such an one as had been already mentioned in the preceding context. The flood, therefore, can be only a figurative designation of the warlike expedition inundating the land, which had been spoken of immediately before, and the sense only, "the desolation of city and temple," will not be merely partial or transient, but be completed during this same expedition, which may be compared to a great inundation. This explanation is confirmed by the usage of Daniel elsewhere, in which warlike expeditions are compared to a flood. Thus 11 : 12; "And the arms of the inundation, הַשֶּׁטֶף, the Egyptian hosts, which had previously done so much mischief to others, shall be overwhelmed by him and destroyed." V. 26; וְתִירְלוּ יִשְׁטוֹף, his host, i. e. the host of Antiochus, will overflow; comp. v. 40, Nah. 1 : 8, Jer. 47 : 2.

It now appears still more clearly, how inadmissible is the reference of these words to the heathen prince, and especially as the recent interpreters suppose, to Antiochus Epiphanes. For, did he meet his end in the same expedition, in which he laid waste the city and temple? The force of this argument appears from the circumstance, that even such interpreters as Hitzig, who have made the grammatical interpretation their chief object, and who therefore can scarcely be supposed to have committed an oversight, have felt compelled to disregard the article. He remarks, l. c. p. 150; "He (Ant. Epiph.), found an end in *a* military expedition, for which שֶׁטֶף is figuratively used." There is rather here a plain *antithesis* with the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes. Of this Daniel never prophecies, without at the same time announcing its end. Chap. 11 : 36, it is said of him; "And he is prosperous, *until* the anger is completed." This oppression, therefore, is not עַד־עֵת (11 : 25); it first reaches its end with the end of its object. This is here expressly asserted, and appears also from the fact, that the prophecy closes with the threatening of the entire ruin of the city and

temple, excluding a mere partial desolation by the expression itself, and containing not the smallest allusion to a restoration.

"*And unto the end is war, a decree of ruins.*"

Interpreters mostly unite these words in one sentence, "and until the end of the war is a decree of ruins." We, however, prefer the view expressed in the translation, because the manifest reference of קִצּוֹ to the foregoing קֵץ is more natural in the end of the whole transaction; because מִלְחָמָה has no article, as it must have, if the subject of discourse were the definite war mentioned before, precisely like שֶׁטֶף; because it designates the definite flood predicted in the preceding verse; and then, moreover, because the decree of ruins has its *terminus a quo* rather than its *terminus ad quem* in the end of the war, a difficulty, which these interpreters obviate only by the inadmissible rendering of שֹׁמֵמוֹת by *devastations*. The sense is, "the war, and the decree of ruins, will terminate only with the end of the object." It is not a transient, hostile oppression, which is here treated of, like that, e. g., in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, but such an one as would cause utter destruction to the city and the temple.

As to the form, גֶּחֱרָצָת can be *stat. absol.* like נִכְחֶדֶת, Zech. 11 : 9; comp. Ewald, p. 346. But as it elsewhere, when in the *stat. absol.*, always has the form נֶחֱרָצָה (comp. Is. 10 : 23, 28 : 22), as this form occurs not only chap. 11 : 36, but also in the prophecy before us, v. 27, as this participle in Niphal always has the force of a substantive, *the cut off*, viz. *sentence*, probably a designation of a firm and irrevocable decision, borrowed from the judicial language (see on v. 27), it is best to understand it with the Syriac, Geier, Hassencamp, Hitzig, as *stat. constr.*

שֹׁמֵמוֹת, according to its very derivation as a participle of the intransitive verb שָׁמַם (comp. on v. 27), can mean nothing but *loca vastata, ruinæ*, by no means *devastations*, in an active sense. This is confirmed also by the usage of the language. It is found in this chapter itself. V. 18; "Behold our desolations," שִׁמְמֹתֵינוּ. In Ezek. 36 : 4, it is combined as an adjective with חֳרָבוֹת, and in Is. 61 : 4, it twice stands with it in the parallelism. It never, even in appearance, assumes the nature of an *abstract*. The "decree of the ruins" is the decree to which the ruins in so far belong, as they are caused by it.

Remarkable is the reference in which these last words stand to the close of v. 25, indicated by the use of the verb חָרִין, in both passages. By an irrevocable decree of God, will the city, now lying in ruins, be rebuilt; by an equally irrevocable decree, will it again sink in ruins.

Verse 27.

"And one week will strengthen the covenant with many, and the half of the week will cause to cease sacrifice and meat offering, and over the summit of abomination comes the destroyer, and, indeed, until that which is completed and cut off shall drop upon that which is laid waste."

"*And one week will confirm the covenant with many.*"

Several interpreters take as the subject of הִגְבִּיר the Messiah, others the heathen prince. Both are equally erroneous, since the mention of neither had immediately preceded. The subject is rather the *week*. Theodotion: *καὶ δυναμώσει διαθήκην πολλοῖς ἑβδομὰς μία.* And we have here an instance of the frequent idiom, according to which, that which happens in a place or a time is attributed to it as an action; comp. in reference to the former, e. g., Ps. 65: 4; "The hills exult, the valleys rejoice." In reference to the latter, Mal. 3: 19; "The day that cometh shall burn them up." Job 3: 3; "The night which said, a man is conceived." V. 10, where the night is cursed, "because it shut not up the doors of the womb." 30: 17; "The night pierces my bones." See abundant examples, from Arabian writers, in Schultens, p. 41; in other writers, by Gronov. *Observv.* 1, 1. Chap. 2.

Some interpreters, (lastly Scholl, l. c. p. 29, 24,) maintain, that the "one week" is not to be so connected with the preceding 69, as though it immediately belonged to them, that the discourse is only of a *hebdomas quæpiam*, which must not indeed vary too far from the remaining 69. This "one week" is that, at the end of which the destruction of Jerusalem falls. But it is easy to see, that this supposition did not spring from an impartial investigation of the text, but from a difficulty arising from a comparison of the prophecy and fulfilment. Vitringa, since whose time the interpretation of this prophecy, after having made no small progress, has, on the

whole, only declined, furnishes us, in the *Hypotyposis Historiæ et Chronol. sacræ*, with a guiding thread, the value of which is still undiminished. Among the leading principles for the interpretation of this prophecy, he says (p. 104): "*Tempus illud LXX. hebdomadarum, s.* 490 *annorum, prænuntiari tanquam quod continua et non interrupta serie decursurum esset ab* initio *usque ad* terminum *sive complementum suum, tam respectu totius hujus temporis LXX. hebdomadarum, quam respectu partium, in quas hæ hebd. dividuntur, hebd.* 7, 62 *et unius hebdomadæ.*" What indeed can be clearer than this proposition? Precisely 70 weeks in all are to elapse: how then, without the most unrestrained caprice, can we assume a not inconsiderable intermediate period between the 69 and the one, which, together, plainly make up these seventy? Who that proceeds in such an arbitrary manner, can still continue to lay any stress on the chronological proof of the agreement of prophecy and fulfilment? Whoever takes to himself this liberty must also grant it, and can make no objection if another chooses, e. g., to insert between the 7 and the 62, a dozen intercalary weeks. What, however, especially refutes this supposition, is, that it cannot point out in the week which it assumes, the characteristic mark of this last week, the confirmation of the covenant. For in the time of the Roman invasion, where were those mighty demonstrations of mercy, which were such a confirmation of the covenant, as to render it proper to give prominence to them alone, and pass over in silence those, which belonged to the actual seventieth week, as well as the week itself? The advocates of this interpretation would gladly free themselves from this objection, by regarding the *one week* to which the confirmation belongs, as the actual 70th, and only the following half week as lying without the cycle of the 70, and embracing the time of the Jewish war. But here a fatal objection intervenes, the article in הַשָּׁבוּעַ, which does not allow us to think of the half of a week in general, but only of the half of the definite, before-mentioned week.

This false view has been occasioned by the opinion, that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans must necessarily be drawn within the circle of the chronological determinations of the prophecy; an opinion, which led the sagacious Scaliger to the most forced assumptions, while Vitringa, l. c. adopts the sound canon: "*Terminari has hebdomadas in triennio illo, quod mortem Jesu Christi proxime excepit, quæ nimirum Jesu Christi mors incidere debuit in medium hebdomadæ ultimæ, post* 7 *et* 62 *hebd. jam elapsas.*" That this

opinion is entirely destitute of support, we shall see when we come to explain "the half of the week will cause sacrifice and meat offering to cease."

That הִגְבִּיר has the meaning *to make strong, to strengthen*, and that we must not, with Bertholdt, p. 666, invent for it another, appears from the derivation, the use of Piel, e. g. Zech. 10 : 6 – 12, and of Hiph. in the only passage where it occurs besides, Ps. 12 : 6, לִלְשֹׁנֵנוּ נַגְבִּיר, "to our tongues will we impart strength; we will so arm them with lies and calumnies, that no man shall be able to resist us." This interpretation is the only one, that is philologically correct, and completely suits the parallelism. הִגְבִּיר has there, also, the meaning *corroboravit*, only with a certain modification, which the construction with לְ has occasioned. The same modification is found so often in Hiph. that it would seem it may be employed in all verbs. Thus, e. g., הִצְדִּיק, with the *accus.*, "to make righteous," with ל, "to impart righteousness"; הוֹדָה, with the *accus.*, "to praise," with לְ, "to impart praise," &c.

The omission of the article in בְּרִית shows, that חִגְבִּיר בְּרִית corresponds with "to confirm a covenant" in English, and that we must not, with several interpreters, take בְּרִית as a definite designation of the already existing covenant, הַבְּרִית, which should be confirmed and glorified by the blessings of the Messiah; on the contrary, nothing whatever is here said, as to whether the covenant is one already existing, or one entirely new. (Comp., e. g., Hassencamp, p. 81.) The indefiniteness belongs, indeed, only to the expression. As to the matter of fact, the language as it now stands is far more emphatic, than הֲקִים בְּרִית in the antithesis with the quality of the previous covenant, which, because not confirmed by such illustrious manifestations of the divine mercy as now appear, must be considered as weaker in reference to that now to be concluded, and which rests on the forgiveness of sins, the imparting of the everlasting righteousness, and the anointing of a holy of holies. Finally, throughout the whole book, בְּרִית occurs only of the covenant of God with Israel, which is of itself sufficient to refute, what is liable to so many objections, the explanation of Bertholdt, of a covenant which Antiochus Epiphanes had made with apostates from among the covenant people.

The article in לָרַבִּים must not be overlooked, as it has been uniformly by interpreters. It shows that the discourse is not concerning many in general, but definitely concerning those, who were

manifest to the reader, from the circumstances of the discourse, as definite in their kind (comp. Ewald, p. 567). Such a definiteness, however, can be derived only from v. 24. The imparting of all the blessings, which the prophet there promises, he here embraces in one comprehensive expression, "to confirm a covenant"; and that he does this, he shows by representing the objects of the confirmation, as those, who do not here first come forward, but are already known from what precedes, and who were the objects of the former gracious promises.

That here, as in chap. 24, that only is spoken of, which the Messiah should vouchsafe to the believers from among the Jews, is evident from the occasion of the prophecy. Daniel was moved to make intercession, by his concern, lest the Lord would entirely reject Israel, on account of his sins. What, therefore, was more natural, than that the divine answer should embrace only what was suited to remove this concern?

We give the admirable paraphrase of the words by Vitringa, *Obss.* t. II. p. 258: "*Habebit tamen deus interea rationem electorum, bene multorum, κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος servandorum, quibus a Christo et apostolis ejus fœdus divinæ gratiæ exponetur, illustribus tam miraculis, quam donis spir. sancti inter illos confirmandum et obsignandum, per 7 potissimum annos, ducendos a tempore, quo dominus munus suum publicum inter Judæos auspicatus fuerit.*"

"*And the half of the week will abolish sacrifice and meat offering.*"

That the confirmation of the covenant extends throughout the whole week, in the midst of which the sacrificial service ceases, shows that this must be, for believers, not a distressing, but a joyful result; that it stands in connexion with the destruction of the temple, predicted immediately after, proves that, in respect to the unbelieving part of the people, it is to be considered as a judgment. If now we inquire for the cause of this cessation of the sacrificial service, we find it to be the death of the Messiah. That the expression, "after the 62 weeks," (reckoned from the going forth of the word, after 69,) v. 26, must not be understood, as though the Messiah should be cut off at the very commencement of the 70th week, is evident from the fact, that otherwise his appearance (comp. v. 25, "from the going forth of the word ... until the Messiah, are 69 weeks,") and his death would coincide; and that we must not go

beyond the middle of the 70th week, in which the abolition of the sacrificial service is placed, is plain, from the words, "after 69 weeks."

But in how far was the sacrificial service abolished by the death of Christ? This question, so far as this abolition is to be considered as a blessing, is easily answered. The Levitical service as weak and unprofitable, (Heb. 7 : 18,) was done away, when, by the death of Christ, the true forgiveness of sin had been obtained, the everlasting righteousness brought in, and, instead of the ancient visible temple, a new spiritual holy of holies anointed. The shadow vanished before the substance, the type before the antitype. In reference, however, to the abolition as a punishment, Frischmuth has already remarked, l. c. p. 932: "*Non agitur de nudo facto, sed de abrogatione legitima.*" The sacrificial service was an attestation by God himself, of his covenant with Israel. (Comp. on Zech. 9 : 11.) As now this covenant was abolished by the murder of his Son, so also at the same time was the sacrificial service, as to its substance, which rested on its being introduced and approved by God, and it was of no importance, if the cessation of sacrifices, as outward actions, did not follow till some time afterwards. For this was only an outward declaration of the decree already executed at the moment of the death of Christ. It served only to take from Israel, what they possessed but in imagination. In like manner, also, the destruction of city and temple by the Romans was only the outward revelation of what, in fact, already existed. The moment the death of Christ took place, Jerusalem was no longer the holy, the temple no longer an house of God, but an abomination. Hence, in reference to all three objects in the prophecy, only the moment is made prominent, and chronologically designated, in which all that followed was already included, and from which it was afterwards developed. An entirely similar mode of representation occurs in Zech. 11, where the madness of internal dissension and the desolation of city and land by outward enemies, are placed in immediate connexion with the rejection of the Messiah, and the relinquishment of his pastoral office. The supernatural agency, which had hitherto guarded both, ceased with this event, and it was of little consequence how much or how little time the natural causes, which accomplished both, required for their developement.

Theodoret calls our attention to the circumstance, that what is here predicted as a consequence of the death of Christ, was symbolized at the moment of its taking place, by the rending of the veil of

the temple (Matt. 27 : 51, Mark 15 : 38); and how just this remark is, according to both respects in which the cessation of the sacrificial service is here predicted, appears from the excellent remarks of Calvin, respecting the import of this symbolic action (*Harm. Evang.*, p. 368), from which we extract only what follows: "*Veli scissura non modo ceremoniarum, quæ sub lege vigebant, abrogatio fuit, sed quædam cœlorum apertio, ut nunc familiariter deus filii sui membra ad se invitet. Interea admoniti fuerunt Judæi, finem externis sacrificiis esse impositum, nullum posthac veteris sacerdotii usum fore; etiamsi staret templi ædificium, non amplius illic consueto ritu colendum esse deum: sed quia jam umbrarum substantia et veritas completa erat, figuras legales in spiritum conversas esse.*"

"*And over the summit of abomination comes the destroyer.*"

Literally, "over summit of abomination comes destroyer." We take כָּנָף, *wing*, as a figurative designation of the summit. It is easy to justify this on philological grounds, since this idiom occurs in Hebrew, as is generally confessed. The wings of a garment, for its ends; the wings of the earth, Is. 11 : 12, for its extremities; in the Rabbinic dialect, כנפי ריאה, *alæ pulmonis*, i. e. *extremitates pulmonis;* in the New Testament, *πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*, Matt. 4 : 5, Luke 4 : 9, spoken of the summit, not, as some suppose, of a wing, but of the temple itself; comp., in opposition to Kuinöl and others, Fritzsche. It is so natural, that it is found in nearly all languages. We cite only some examples from the Greek: *πτερύγιον* is explained by Suidas and Hesychius directly by *ἀκρωτήριον*. The latter gives the following examples of this usage: *πτερύγια, μέρος τι τοῦ ὑμοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύμονος τοῦ λοβοῦ τὰ ἄκρα, καὶ τοῦ ὠτὸς τὸ ἄνω, καὶ ξίφους τὰ ἑκατέρωθεν, ἢ τὰ ἄκρα τῶν ἱματίων.* According to Pollux, the extreme part of the rudder is called *πτερὰ*, (1, 62.) Several passages, however, from Greek writers, which have been adduced by various older interpreters after the example of Nicol. Abraham, in the *Pharus*, are not to the point; such are those in which *ἀετός* or *ἀετώματα* (comp. Suid. s. v. and Pollux) occurs, as a designation of the roofs of a building in general, and especially of the temple, according to Suid. and Hesych.; also *πτέρυγες*, because these appellations relate only to the form of the roofs, and do not designate them as the highest part of the building, which alone would suit the passage before us. — In respect to שִׁקּוּצִים, *abomination*, we do not exclude the special reference to idols, partly

because this reference is usual (it is wanting, perhaps, only in Nah. 3 : 6), partly on account of several passages hereafter to be cited from older writers, which seem to serve as the groundwork of this, and in which this reference prevails. The wing of abomination, in our view, is the summit of the temple, so desecrated by abomination, that it no longer deserves the name of the temple of the Lord, but that of the temple of idols. We find, in this designation, the reason why the ruin here predicted comes upon the temple.

We take מְשֹׁמֵם in the sense *destroyer*. Relying on the usual meaning of *Poel*, on chap. 11 : 31, where the *part.* מְשֹׁמֵם undeniably occurs in this sense, on the manifest antithesis between מְשֹׁמֵם and שׁוֹמֵם, the latter of which, unless all philological investigation is to be contemned, can mean nothing else than the *destroyed*.

That the destroyer should *be* or *come* over the summit of the temple, we regard as a designation of its utter ruin, inasmuch as the seizure of the highest part presupposes the possession of all the rest; a stronghold, e. g., is completely taken, when the enemy has mastered its highest battlements.

In favor of our interpretation, whose philological correctness no one will venture to doubt, and the characteristic mark of which is, that it makes the destruction of the temple to be occasioned by a profanation of it, caused by the covenant people themselves, we offer the following positive arguments.

1. This interpretation admirably coincides with the whole remaining contents of the prophecy. The ancient temple is designated as converted, by the unbelief of the people and the murder of the Messiah, from a house of God into a house of abomination, which must be destroyed, in antithesis with a new real temple, a holy of holies, which, according to v. 24, in the end of the 70 weeks should be anointed. To the cessation of sacrifices, which are sacrifices no longer, corresponds the destruction of the temple, which is no longer a temple, a dwelling-place of the true God.

2. The destruction of the second temple stands in the closest relation to that of the first. How both, to the exclusion of all accident, were solely an effect of the penal justice of God, who avenged the apostasy of his people and the desecration of his sanctuary, he has made known in a way which should open the eyes of the most blind, and show him that the Theocracy was not an illusion, but a reality. The second destruction happened on precisely the same day as the first. *Ἡμέρᾳ*, says Josephus (*De Bello Jud.* 6. 4, 5,

p. 385. Haverc.), after relating how Titus had determined to spare the temple, a determination, which was rendered nugatory by the previous divine decree, — *παρῆν δ᾽ ἡ εἱμαρμένη χρόνων περίοδος, ἡμέρᾳ δεκάτῃ λώου μηνὸς, καθ᾽ ἣν καὶ τὸ πρότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν Βαβυλωνίων βασιλέως ἐνεπρήσθη.* Surely it requires a strong degree of false belief, and of genuine unbelief, to suppose that chance should have so skilfully discovered the only prize among three hundred and sixty-four blanks! If, however, it were not chance, what a seal has the hand of God impressed on the book of his revelations! The connexion of the two events affords no small argument for the true interpretation of a passage, which predicts the latter, when, according to it, cause and effect appear in the same relation as in the predictions of the former destruction; and the more so, since Daniel himself was a witness of this relation, and as he had converted the writings of the older prophets into flesh and blood, and by the study of them been excited to the intercession, which occasioned the prophecy before us. We now proceed to a consideration of these passages. 2 Kings 21 : 2, &c., it is said, "Manasseh did evil in the sight of the Lord, after the abomination of the heathen, whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel; — and built altars in the temple of the Lord, — and he placed the image of Ascherath which he had made, in the temple. — And the Lord spake by his servants the prophets, Because Manasseh has done these abominations, — and has made Judah also to sin with his idols, — therefore, thus saith the Lord, — Behold I bring evil upon Jerusalem and Judah, and I stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria, — and I destroy the remnant of mine inheritance, and deliver them into the hand of their enemies, — because they have done evil in my sight." Jer. 7; "They placed their abominations in the house which is called by my name in order to pollute it. — Is then this house, which I called by my name, become a den of thieves in your eyes? — Therefore will I do unto the house which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and to the place, which I have given to you and your fathers, as I have done to Shiloh." Ezek. 5 : 11; "Wherefore, as I live, saith the Lord God, surely because thou hast defiled my sanctuary with all thy detestable things, and with all thine abominations (בְּכָל־שִׁקּוּצַיִךְ וּבְכָל־תּוֹעֲבֹתָיִךְ), therefore will I also take away, neither shall mine eye spare, neither will I have any pity." Ezek. 7 : 8, 9; "I recompense thee for all thine abominations. — I will recompense thee according to thy ways, and thine abominations shall be in the midst

of thee." V. 20; "And his beautiful ornament he hath changed into haughtiness, and the images of their abominations they made for detestable things therein, therefore do I give it to them for impurity, and I give it (their ornament) into the hand of the strangers for a prey, and to the ungodly for a spoil, and they pollute it." V. 22; "My face will I turn also from them, and they, the enemy, pollute my secret place (the holy of holies), and the evil doers enter therein, and defile it." Several, as Rosenmüller, after the example of Jerome, prefer here by צְבִי עֶדְיוֹ (not "the ornament of his beauty," but "his beautiful ornament") to understand *aurum atque argentum atque bona omnia, quæ illis divinitus obtigerunt.* For the temple, however, חִלֵּלוּהָ, in v. 21, is decisive, and also v. 23, where, by way of climax, the subject of discourse is "the holy of holies." V. 20; "I give it them for impurity (the sanctuary, which they have polluted, shall serve them for impurity, instead of sanctification); the parallel passage, 24 : 11, "Behold, I desecrate my sanctuary, my splendid ornament, the desire of your eyes, the food of your souls;" comp. Jer. 7 : 4, Is. 66 : 3, 4. Now to these prophecies that of Daniel stands in the same relation, which we have already pointed out between Zechariah, chap. 11, and the two prophecies of Jeremiah.

3. "Where the carcase is, there the eagles collect." This declaration of the Lord discloses to us the cause of all the desolations, which have passed, and will still pass over his church, under the old and the new covenant. This connexion between the *where* and the *there* is also found in the case of the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes and an attentive consideration of the passages relating to it shows us, that Daniel here perceives it, nay, that he studiously exhibits it, particularly that he represents the heathenish desecration of the temple as a consequence of one, which had proceeded from the covenant people themselves, and thus we are the more inclined to assume, that he directs our attention here also to the repetition of this fundamental law. These passages are the following. Chap. 11 : 31, it is said, "and arms will arise out of him, and pollute the sanctuary, the strong place, and take away that which is constant, and make the abomination (הַשֹּׁקְּצִין) as one that is laid waste." This passage is the more important, since it even has characteristic expressions in common with the one before us, which implies an internal relationship of both. We take (זְרֹעִים, *arms*, in the sense, *powerful*, and refer the *suff.* in מִמֶּנּוּ to בְּרִית in the preceding verse, explaining the masculine by the supposition, that *covenant* stands for

covenant people, (comp. Ewald, p. 640,) just as זְרוֹעַ, which is always *femin.*, here, on account of its sense, is construed as *masc.* In the expressions, "they take away," and "that which is constant," there is a manifest antithesis. They take away, that which should not be interrupted for a moment, every sign of the worship and dominion of the Lord. Most interpreters erroneously refer this exclusively to the daily sacrifices. As it stands here, תָּמִיד never occurs of one particular object, but, with the adjuncts, not only of the daily sacrifice, but also of the fire of the altar, of the sacrificial lamps, of the shew-bread, &c. The prophet embraces all this, as Gousset, s. v., rightly perceived. *To give* stands in reference to *to take away*. They put in its place. By הַשִּׁקּוּץ, *the abomination*, is designated all that is ungodly. They give this as *something to be destroyed*, because the practice of it brings its destruction, as a righteous punishment, exactly corresponding to, "they desecrate the sanctuary, the strong-hold." Because they have polluted that which hitherto afforded them a sure protection, the temple, so are they henceforth by a righteous retribution given up as a defenceless prey to their enemies. A contrast to the giving of the abomination as a thing to be destroyed, as of the *terminus a quo* of the oppression, is formed by the giving of the abomination, as a thing to be wasted, its destruction to be effected by God, as the *terminus ad quem*. According to this interpretation, therefore, this passage entirely coincides with the one before us, according to the explanation we have given. Both make the *abomination* one, "*quæ vastationis syrma, ut peccatum pœnam post se trahit. — Abominationes considerantur ut peccatum et antecedens, quod per supervenientem vastatorem justo dei judicio vindicatur.*" (Lampe, in the valuable treatise on the *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*, in the *Bibl. Brem.*, cl. 3, p. 990 sq.) Bertholdt indeed, with most older interpreters, explains differently: "And *his* garrison (i. e. of Antiochus) will desecrate the fortified sanctuary, remove the daily sacrifice, and set up the abomination of desolation." Accordingly, the scandal would be designated, not as proceeding out of the midst of the covenant people themselves, but from the heathen. This interpretation, however, besides the unphilological explanation of הַתָּמִיד and הַשִּׁקּוּץ מְשֹׁמֵם, is liable to the following objections. 1. The connexion. V. 30, 32, the subject of discourse is, the members of the covenant people, who apostatized from the covenant of the Lord. How comes it, then, that the mention of the heathen garrison should be thus introduced between? 2. The comparison

of chap. 8, where, in like manner, the abomination is something originating from the covenant people themselves; comp. also 11 : 14. 3. זְרִיעִים cannot be taken in the sense *hosts*. For then, as v. 15, 22, the *fem.* would stand. 4. הַמָּעוֹז also, *the strong-hold*, implies a desecration on the part of the covenant people themselves. In the antithesis with חִלְּלוּ, it directs our attention to the guilt and folly of the action. They robbed themselves of their strong-hold. — The *second* passage is that of chap. 8 : 12. וְצָבָא תִּנָּתֵן עַל־הַתָּמִיד בְּפָשַׁע. We translate: "And the host is given up on account of that which is constant, as sin," i. e. because through the covenant people, the abolition of that which is constant, the sign of the worship and dominion of the Lord, has been committed, so will they be given up to righteous punishment as sin, so treated as if they were sin itself personified. That צָבָא, *host*, here *fem.* as Is. 40 : 2, and uniformly in the plural, can be understood only of "the host of the Lord, the covenant people," appears from its occurring in that sense, v. 10, 11. That בְּפָשַׁע must be translated by, *as sin* (בְּ here serves to designate the relation of the special to the general; comp. the passages cited on v. 26), is plain from v. 13, where the covenant people is designated directly as הַפֶּשַׁע. We must translate, "How long will the vision endure, that which is constant, and the wickedness laid waste, the giving up, as well of the sanctuary, as the host, to devastation?" To שֹׁמֵם, as "a thing destroyed," תֵּת מִרְמָס corresponds, "to give as a trampling upon"; to הַתָּמִיד, קֹדֶשׁ; to הַפֶּשַׁע, צָבָא. If now this interpretation of בְּפָשַׁע is incontestably just, so must עַל־הַתָּמִיד, the ground of this giving as sin, designate that, whereby the covenant people have been changed from righteousness into crime, the desecration of the sanctuary caused by their fault; as it had been previously described. The explanation we have given is confirmed by v. 23, according to which the oppression of the covenant people should take place, בְּהָתֵם הַפֹּשְׁעִים, when the transgressors have finished, filled up, the measure of sin, and thereby brought punishment with violence. — In favor of our interpretation of both passages, the historical fulfilment gives a remarkable testimony. In all three sources of the history of the oppressions by Antiochus Epiphanes, they are uniformly designated as a consequence of the abomination proceeding from the covenant people themselves, as a righteous retribution. Particularly do the Jews, and not the heathen, appear as the proper authors of the desecration of the temple. We the more readily produce some passages, since they serve at the same time to exhibit clearly the general mode

of God's proceeding in this respect, as it lies at the foundation of prophecy and its fulfilment, and therefore constitutes a testimony in favor of our interpretation, entirely independent of the passages of Daniel. The apostate members of the covenant people were the cause of the suffering, not only so far as they first caused Antiochus to intermeddle with the affairs of the covenant people (comp. 1 Macc. 1 : 11), but also in the higher point of view, inasmuch as they hastened the divine vengeance by their crimes; comp. 2 Macc. 4 : 15, sq.: *καὶ τὰς μὲν πατρῴας τιμὰς ἐν οὐδενὶ τιθέμενοι, τὰς δὲ ἑλληνικὰς δόξας καλλίστας ἡγούμενοι· ὧν καὶ χάριν περιέσχεν αὐτοὺς χαλεπὴ περίστασις, καὶ ὧν ἔζήλουν τὰς ἀγωγὰς καὶ καθάπαν ἤθελον ἔξομοιοῦσθαι, τούτους πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητὰς ἔσχον· ἀσεβεῖν γὰρ εἰς τοὺς θείους νόμους οὐ ῥᾴδιον, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα ὁ ἀκόλουθος καιρὸς δηλώσει.* Through them the city lost its prosperity, which the Lord had formerly secured to it, while a better disposition yet prevailed; comp. 3 : 1, 2 : *τῆς ἁγίας τοίνυν πόλεως κατοικουμένης μετὰ πάσης εἰρήνης καὶ τῶν νόμων ἔτι κάλλιστα συντηρουμένων διὰ τὴν Ὀνίου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως εὐσέβειάν τε καὶ μισοπονηρίαν· συνέβαινε καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τιμᾶν τὸν τόπον, καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀποστολαῖς ταῖς κρατίστοις δοξάζειν.* The apostates were, indirectly, the only cause, directly the accessories of the desecration of the sanctuary; comp. 1 Macc. 1 : 33, sq.: The Syrians built a castle *καὶ ἔθηκαν ἐκεῖ ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλὸν, ἄνδρας παρανόμους, καὶ ἐνίσχυσαν ἐν αὐτῇ.* That here by the sinful people and the transgressors of the law, apostate members of the covenant people are designated, appears partly from the words themselves, partly from Josephus (*Archæol.* 12. 5, 4; comp. J. D. Michaelis on the passage); v. 36 : *καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς ἔνεδρον τῷ ἁγιάσματι καὶ εἰς διάβολον πονηρὸν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διαπαντὸς, καὶ ἐξέχεαν αἷμα ἀθῷον κύκλῳ τοῦ ἁγιάσματος, καὶ ἐμόλυναν τὸ ἁγίασμα.* Even the setting up of *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*, the abomination, which brought desolation after it, the heathenish altar, was effected by the aid of these apostates; comp. v. 52 sq.: *καὶ συνηθροίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πολλοί· πᾶς ὁ ἐγκαταλείπων τὸν νόμον, καὶ ἐποίησαν κακὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, κ. τ. λ., καὶ ᾠκοδόμησαν βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἐν πόλεσιν Ἰούδα κύκλῳ ᾠκοδόμησαν βωμούς.* And on account of all these crimes, the wrath of God fell upon Israel; comp. v. 64 : *καὶ ἐγένετο ὀργὴ μεγάλη ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ σφόδρα.* As the gates of Jerusalem were opened to Antiochus by the apostates (comp. Jos. 12. 5, 3,), so when, with impious hand, he defiled the sanctuary, he was guided by Menelaus, *τὸν καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος προδότην γεγονότα.*

2 Macc. 5 : 15, sq. The ground why the Lord permitted this desecration is in the same place, v. 17, thus given: *διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων ἀπώργισται βραχέως ὁ δεσπότης· διὸ γέγονε περὶ τὸν τόπον παρόρασις.* The connexion, in general, of the fate of the temple with the conduct of the people is admirably unfolded in v. 19, sq.: *Οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον τὸ ἔθνος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἔθνος τὸν τόπον ὁ κύριος ἐξελέξατο· διόπερ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τόπος συμμετασχὼν τῶν τοῦ ἔθνους δυσπετημάτων γενομένων, ὕστερον εὐεργετημάτων ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκοινώνησε, καὶ ὁ καταληφθεὶς ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ, πάλιν ἐν τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου δεσπότου καταλλαγῇ μετὰ πάσης δόξης ἐπανορθώθη.*

4. This interpretation has the testimony of tradition in its favor. This appears from the passage of Josephus, *bell. Jud. IV.*, 6, 3, p. 292, where it is said of the Zelotes, *καὶ τὴν κατὰ τῆς πατρίδος προφητείαν τέλους ἠξίωσαν· ἦν γὰρ δή τις παγαιὸς λόγος ἀνδρῶν, ἔνθα τότε τὴν πόλιν ἁλώσεσθαι, καὶ καταφλεγήσεσθαι τὰ ἅγια νόμῳ πολέμου, στάσις ἐὰν κατασκήψῃ, καὶ χεῖρες οἰκεῖαι προμιαίνωσι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τέμενος· οἷς οὐκ ἀπιστήσαντες οἱ ζηλωταὶ διακόνους ἑαυτοὺς ἐπέδοσαν.* That by the *παλαιὸς λόγος ἀνδρῶν* here, the prophecy before us is to be understood, admits of no doubt, (comp. Beitr. 1, p. 265.) According to this passage, by שִׁקּוּצִים was understood *abominations*, through which the temple had been polluted by the corrupt members of the covenant people themselves; and how generally diffused was not only the reference to the destruction by the Romans in general, but also this special interpretation, appears from the express remark of Josephus, that the Zelotes themselves adopted it; comp. also 6. 2, 3.

5. This interpretation is confirmed by the most weighty of all authorities, that of the Lord himself. This, however, on account of the manifold misinterpretations of his declarations concerning it, needs to be pointed out more at large. Passages are, Matt. 24 : 15, 16, *ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἑστὼς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ — ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω — τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη*; and Mark 13 : 14, *ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἑστὼς ὅπου οὐ δεῖ· ὁ ἀναγ. ν.· τότε οἱ κ. τ. λ.* According to the prevailing interpretation, which, e. g., Schott has attempted fully to establish (*comment. in serm. de reditu*, p. 47, sq.) *βδέλ. τ. ἐρημ.* is rendered *abominatio devastationis*, *abominatio devastanda*, which, according to Kuinöl, stands as the *abstr.* for *concr.*, for *detestabilis desolator*. This now designates *exercitum Romanorum Hieros. devastaturum, milites paganos idolorum cultores, ideoque*

vel hac de causa abominandos. We, on the contrary, following such excellent predecessors as Olearius (*Observv. in Mat.* p. 682), Lampe, l. c., Reland, and Elsner, understand by *βδέλ. τ. ἐρ.* the abomination, which being set up by the covenant people themselves, must have for its inevitable consequence, the desolation, the abomination to which the desolation belongs, as effect to cause. A genitive exactly like that in *αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας*, 2 Pet. 2 : 1, and similar to the *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς*. We explain the word *ἑστὼς* from the figurative designation of the abomination, also found in Daniel, whereby the temple was polluted, as idols there set up, borrowed from an earlier period, where the abomination actually exhibited itself, in this manner (comp. the passages cited from the writings before the exile).

That the chief argument brought for the prevailing explanation, viz. that, in the parallel passage of Luke 21 : 20 (*ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, τότε γνῶτε, ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς*) the encompassing of the city by the Romans is given as a mark of the impending destruction, and as a sign that it is time to fly, has no validity, we have already shown in the *Beitr.* I. p. 268. For why may we not well assume, that the Lord, whether at the same or at another time, might direct attention to various signs of the destruction from the prophecy of Daniel, that Luke records the *outward* sign, which he had taken from Dan. 9 : 26, (*καὶ βασιλεία ἐθνῶν φθερεῖ τὴν πόλιν,*) and, indeed, precisely this, because it was in itself the most plain, and did not, like the other, presuppose, in order to be understood, a deeper acquaintance with Daniel, which Luke could not expect from his readers, while Matthew and Mark, on the contrary, recorded the *internal*, derived from v. 27, which coincided as to time, with the outward, so that the attentive observer might find satisfaction concerning both?

On the contrary, this interpretation is liable to such great difficulties, that we cannot but wonder, how it has continued to prevail, since it has been opposed by the true one. The greatness of these difficulties assumes a different form according to the different interpretation, which its advocates give of the words *ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ*, without, however, being at all lessened in either case. If, with Beza and others, we understand by them the temple, no reason can be given why, as the proper time for flight, precisely the moment is designated when it is too late, and when it is no longer possible for those, who have happily survived the inexpressible wretchedness of the siege, from which the Lord certainly wished to preserve his disciples. Nor can this difficulty be

removed by the parallel passage of Luke. For although the signs in the different evangelists need not necessarily be the same, still they must coincide as to time, and can by no means be separated so far from each other, as the commencement of the siege of a city and its complete capture. If, with others, and indeed with most defenders of this interpretation, we choose to understand by the τόπος ἅγιος the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, we avoid Charybdis only to fall upon Scylla. For that by τόπος ἅγιος, the temple must necessarily be understood, appears, 1. From the word itself. The passages need not be cited, where Jerusalem is designated as a holy city, Palestine as a holy land. Instead of such we should endeavour to find only one where precisely τόπος ἅγιος occurs of any thing else than the temple. Among the very numerous passages in the Alexandrian version, and in the New Testament (comp. e. g. Acts 6 : 13, κατὰ τοῦ τόπου ἁγίου τούτου. 21 : 28, κεκοίνωκε τὸν ἅγιον τόπον), we shall certainly seek in vain. That מָקוֹם, τόπος, was already among the Jews a usual designation of the temple, has been shown by Le Moyne, among others, *Comment. in Jer.* 23, p. 165. Schott, indeed, appeals to Is. 60 : 13; here, however, the subject of discourse is not the region round Jerusalem, but the temple, in the Hebrew, as well as in the Seventy. It is promised, that the costly wood of Lebanon should serve for the glorious building of the temple: καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ Λιβάνου πρὸς σὲ ἥξει — δοξάσαι τὸν τόπον τὸν ἅγιόν μου. 2. The expression βδέλυγμα τ. ἐρ. shows, as is generally conceded, that the Lord had in view the translation of the Seventy, although, on the other hand, the improvement in ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, instead of their ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν, shows that he adhered to it only so far, as it rendered the original text correctly. If now the subject of discourse in the Seventy, as well as in the original, is the temple, how can any thing else be understood by τόπος ἅγιος, especially since immediately after the phrase ἑστ. ἐν τ. ἁγ. the reference to Daniel follows? 3. That the temple only can be spoken of, is evident from referring to what precedes. The outward occasion of his discourse was the circumstance, that the disciples showed to the Lord the buildings of the temple; he had described their ἐρήμωσις, v. 2, and the disciples had asked him when this would happen. When, therefore, in direct reference to what had preceded, an abomination of desolation is spoken of, which should stand in the holy place, why should we not understand by this holy place, that which had before been designated as such?

The positive argument for our interpretation, according to which

the desolation is designated as belonging to the inward sign, precisely as in Luke to the outward, are the following: 1. The Lord does not further explain what is meant by the *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*, but presupposes it either to be already known, or to be sought from Daniel, to whom he expressly refers. Now, as we have already shown from Josephus, שִׁקּוּצִים and *βδέλυγμα* were at that time generally referred to a pollution of the temple, which should be caused by the covenant people themselves. Would then the Lord, if he had not approved of this interpretation, have satisfied himself with a bare allusion; would he not have given some indication concerning the sense of the *βδ. τ. ἐρ.*? 2. According to our interpretation, the passage has a remarkable parallel in that of Matt. 24: 28, *ὅπου γὰρ ἐὰν ᾖ τὸ πτῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί.* Without dwelling upon the various misconceptions of this passage, so clear in itself, ("where sin is, there also punishment comes,"— the figure borrowed from Job 39: 30,) we only remark, that the *γὰρ*, on which Fritzsche grounds his remarkable perversion of the sense, is most naturally explained thus: "The coming of Christ will not take place in one secret corner, but be visible to the whole earth. *For* where the dead body is, there the eagles collect." But now the dead body will be over the whole earth, the eagles, therefore, will appear throughout its whole extent, and not as formerly in Judea alone. This passage, in its connexion, refers indeed in the first instance to the general judgment; but still only in such a manner that the entirely general declaration is there especially applied, and even on account of its universality, it has, at the same time, a concurrent reference to all former judgments, which serve as preludes to this last. The close connexion also between the different manifestations of the divine justice, already appear from the connexion, which, throughout the whole discourse of the Lord, the destruction of Jerusalem sustains to the final judgment of the world. 3. Our interpretation admirably agrees with the history. That even Titus himself perceived, that the fearful abomination, whereby the temple had been defiled, caused the destruction, is manifest from several passages of Josephus. Josephus is thoroughly penetrated with this thought. He says, e. g. (*De Bell. Jud.* lib. 4. 5, 2, p. 287,) after he has related the death of true friends of their country, *ἀλλ' οἶμαι κατακρίνας ὁ Θεὸς ὡς μεμιασμένης τῆς πόλεως ἀπώλειαν, καὶ πυρὶ βουλόμενος ἐκκαθαρθῆναι τὰ ἅγια, τοὺς ἀντεχομένους αὐτῶν καὶ φιλοστοργοῦντας περιέκοψε.*

The difference between the words of Daniel, and those of the

Lord, consists only in the circumstance, that in Daniel the language is more general; the temple in general, in and after the death of Christ, is represented as one desecrated by idolatrous abominations, and therefore devoted to destruction, while the Lord, whose chief object was to give to his followers an outward and perceptible sign of the immediately impending destruction (comp. the ὅταν ἴδητε), renders prominent one particular moment of this desecration, that in which what previously existed, but was more invisible, is made perceptible to the outward senses in so frightful a form, that even many of those, who had been the abetters of the invisible desecration, were seized with horror in view of it; just as the history of the Zelotes in Josephus is conceivable only by the fact, that crime, when it has arrived at its highest pitch, always becomes a sort of madness.

Having established our interpretation, we now take a view of those which differ from it. The first to be considered, is that of Lampe, which, essentially the same, differs only in the understanding of כָּנָף. This he interprets as a designation, not of the summit of the temple, but of the temple itself; the wing, not as the extremity, but as that which protects and covers, appealing to the passages where, as Exod. 19 : 14, Deut. 32 : 11, 12, Ps. 17 : 8, 36 : 8, Mal. 4 : 2, the care of God over his people is represented under the image of the protection, which eagles or other birds afford to the young (comp. l. c. p. 1010 sq.) A parallel according to this interpretation would be furnished by the passage, chap. 11 : 31, "And they profaned the sanctuary, the stronghold;" כָּנָף would only be the figurative expression for מָעוֹז. Against this view, however, the use of the *sing.* כנף is decisive, since uniformly, where the wing is used as an image of protection, as well in the cited passages of the Old Testament, as in those brought forward by Lampe, from Greek and Latin writers, we find the plural, in accordance with the nature of the case. Lampe appeals indeed to Ps. 91 : 4, בְּאֶבְרָתוֹ יָסֶךְ לָךְ; but אֶבְרָה, there used collectively, *feathers*, must not be confounded with כָּנָף. In addition to this, is the great harshness of the expression, "wing of abomination," for the temple, which, if kept holy, would be a protection, but is now changed into a place of abomination, therefore cannot justify the vain confidence, which the people perpetually repose in it.

The explanation of Jahn, l. c. p. 161, "*super alam abominationum, h. e. super abominabilem exercitum seditiosorum et latronum*," corresponds in a measure, as to the thought, with ours. Against

which, however, the simple objection is decisive, that the *sing.* כנף cannot be used of a host; and this is altogether natural, since the comparison of the hostile army with a bird of prey, who spreads out his wings over his spoil, lies at the foundation of the figure. Is. 8 : 8, to which Jahn appeals, has the *dual* כְּנָפַיִם. Also אֲבָרִים, *wings*, stands in Ezekiel, of a host, only in the plur. This also occurs in the parallel passage adduced from Arabic writers by Gesenius, on Isaiah, I. p. 335, and in the *Thes.* s. v. נפף. We need therefore scarcely remark, that even the verb שָׁמַם leads to the idea of the building, as that which is to be destroyed, especially when v. 26 is compared, where שִׁמָּמוֹת occurs of the ruins of the city and the temple, to which in the verse before us, מְשֹׁמֵם as the *agens*, שָׁמֵם as the *patiens*, of the desolation, correspond, and especially that the collocation of the desolation with the doing away of the sacrificial service, suggests at once the temple, &c.

Among the interpretations which fundamentally differ from ours, we notice, first, that of Bertholdt, "On the roof of a wing of a sanctuary, will the abomination of desolation stand." "The statue is here meant, which Antiochus Epiphanes caused to be erected to Jupiter Olympus on the roof of a wing of the temple." This interpretation is liable to so many objections, that we need not urge that this setting up of the statue, is a pure fiction (comp. *Beitr.* I. p. 86), and the whole reference of the prophecy to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, is only an invention of that obstinate unbelief, which mocks at all argument. 1. It testifies against itself, by confessing the necessity of changing the *stat. constr.* כְּנַף into the *stat. absol.* כָּנָף. 2. Even admitting the correctness of the supposed emendation, the alleged sense cannot possibly be deduced from the words, without violating all the rules of grammar. How could שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם, mean "abominations of desolation"? מְשֹׁמֵם, Bertholdt asserts, is a *part. noun*, "desolation," according to the form מְכַסֶּה, "a covering," מְתָעֵב, "an abomination." But מְתָעֵב does not occur in the sense attributed to it, but only as a *part.* in *Piel* in a transitive meaning, comp. on Is. 49 : 7; and מְכַסֶּה is no abstract noun. What Ewald (p. 237) observes, concerning the form of the *part. Kal*, "They can, indeed, as *neut. part.* be transferred also to things, but never form abstract substantives," is still more just of the *part. Piel*, which, as in general the *part.* of the derivative conjugation, adheres more closely to its origin than the *part. Kal.* And, although this interpretation were in general admissible, still it could not be applied here, on account of

the manifest antithesis of מְשֹׁמֵם and שׁוֹמֵם as the *agens* and *patiens*, and the less so, since this antithesis occurs elsewhere in Daniel, comp. 11 : 31 with 12 : 11. And then, what is accomplished by this effort? The *stat. absol.* שִׁקּוּצִים cannot stand for the *stat. constr.* It is true, that in Hebrew the deficiency of composite nouns is supplied, not only by the connexion of two nouns in the *stat. constr.*, but also by their juxtaposition in the *stat. absol.*; comp. e. g. יַיִן תַּרְעֵלָה, *wine of tumult*, Ps. 60 : 5, and אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת, *God of hosts*, Ps. 80 : 15, and עֲנָוָה־צֶדֶק, *mildness and righteousness*, Ps. 45 : 5, in which case the pronunciation supplied the want of a grammatical designation of a close connexion. — But this sort of combination occurs only with those nouns, the meanings of which should be combined in one conception, while the designation by the *stat. constr.* is much wider, and indicates every sort of relation of one noun to the other. Such a combination, however, in respect to the "abomination of desolation," can by no means be here assumed. The easiest of all combinations, a mere juxtaposition, would be suitable here, since idols could not be considered as a cause of the desolation.

The interpretation of Hitzig still remains, who, (l. c. p. 150) connecting these words with what follows, translates, "and over the summit of the abomination of desolation, and until, &c. will it pour itself." In order to vindicate for שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם the sense, *abomination of desolation*, he appeals to אַדְנִים קָשֶׁה, Is. 19 : 4, where in like manner a noun in the *plur.* is joined with an *adject.* in the *sing.* But who would draw the conclusion from one such example, that in general *every plural* may stand for the *singular*? This is rather the case only with a few determinative nouns, in which the *plur.* form serves simply as a designation of the abstract, as בְּעָלִים, אֱלֹהִים, אֲדֹנִים, the last two, when they stand precisely in the sense, *dominion*, comp. Ewald, p. 641. Would any one, however, explain שִׁקּוּצִים, which never occurs except as an actual *plur.*, according to this analogy, he could only translate, "desolating dominion of idols." But what would this be? Could the dead idols of Antiochus Epiphanes be considered as authors of the desolation? And what is meant by "over the wing, or the summit of the desolation, the dominion of idols"? Not to mention that the erroneous understanding of כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה, as well as of תַּהַךְ and שֹׁמֵם is inseparably connected with this interpretation.

"And indeed until that which is completed and cut off shall drop upon that which is made desolate."

We first investigate the meaning of כָּלָה. Interpreters and lexicographers, commonly take as such that of the *completion*, which is here supposed to stand for the finished desolation. Suspicion is awakened against this sense even by the form of the word. It is the *fem.* of the *adject.* כָּלֶה, as יָפָה of יָפֶה. The *masc.* occurs, Deut. 28 : 32, in the sense *deficiens, tabescens.* To the form as כָּלֶה of the verbs לה, however, the form כָּתֵב, of the regular verbs corresponds, which always forms adjectives of an intransitive meaning, never abstract nouns; and, least of all, those of a transitive meaning, comp. Ewald, p. 231, 422. What we thus learn from the form is confirmed by the usage of the language. כָּלָה never occurs, except as the *fem.* or *neut.* for that which is finished. This sense is evident, e. g., Zeph. 1 : 8, where כָּלָה is joined with another *part.* כִּי כָלָה אַךְ־ נְבֹהָלָה יַעֲשֶׂה אֵת כָּל־ יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ, "for that which is completed, only that which is terrible (בָּהַל in Niph. never precisely *to haste*) does the Lord with all inhabitants of the land." It is equally evident in the passage before us and Is. 10 : 23, 28 : 22, where כָּלָה is joined with another *part.* That the frequent phrase, עָשָׂה כִלָּה, is not to be translated, "for a completion," but "to make to a finished thing," is evident from Jer. 46 : 28, "For that which is finished will I do among all nations, but thee I will not make to that which is finished." Gen. 18 : 21, "Yet I will go down and see whether they עָשׂוּ כָלָה according to the cry that comes to me, or not, will I know," is to be explained, either, whether they have made their sin complete, with reference to the foregoing verse, "The cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is very great, and their sin is very grievous," or whether they have made it full, whether they have carried it to the uttermost.

The completion can now refer, either to the decree or the execution. Of the completion of the decree, the verb כָּלָה often occurs. Thus e. g. 1 Sam. 20 : 7, "When he, Saul, shall rage, then know כִּי־כָלְתָה הָרָעָה מֵעִמּוֹ, that the evil is completed on his part," that he has formed the firm and irrevocable determination to execute it. In like manner v. 9, 1 Sam. 25 : 17, "And now consider and see, what thou doest, כִּי־כָלְתָה הָרָעָה אֶל אֲדֹנֵינוּ וְעַל־ כָּל־ בֵּיתוֹ, since the evil is firmly decreed for our Lord and over his whole house." Esth. 7 : 7, "For Haman saw, כִּי־ כָלְתָה אֵלָיו הָרָעָה מֵאֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ, that the evil

was firmly decreed against him from the king." These passages show that the word is not only used in general for a decree, but is limited by the usage, especially to the finished determination to inflict suffering upon any one. In a good sense, it never occurs, comp. still Prov. 22 : 8, and Schultens on the passage. Even this *adj.* כָּלָה is, 1 Sam. 20 : 33, used as a designation of such a finished decree, "And Jonathan perceived, כִּי־כָלָה הִיא מֵעִם אָבִיו לְהָמִית אֶת־דָּוִד, that there was a firm decree, on the part of his father, to kill David." That כָּלָה is here also to be referred to a thing completed as to the purpose not the execution, is evident, 1. From its collocation with another word, designating the firmness and irrevocable nature of the decree. 2. From תַּהַךְ, which is always used of the cause of the destruction, the divine anger, or the divine penal sentence, never of the destruction itself. 3. From the comparison of Is. 28 : 22, where the same phrase כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה is designated as an object of *hearing:* "A thing completed and cut off, heard I from the Lord, the Almighty."

The entirely similar connexion of both words in the passage before us, and in the two of Isaiah, in which they were rightly understood by the Apostle Paul, Rom. 9 : 7, and after him by Vitringa, but erroneously by Gesenius, makes it highly probable that in this connexion, they formed a judicial technical term, the firm and irrevocable final decree. Perhaps especially in the case of life and death. It is, therefore, unnecessary with Hitzig, to assume, that Daniel borrowed from Isaiah, and we may thus easily explain the verbal agreement of the two passages of the latter. "The judgment is pronounced."

We do not consider the sentence, with nearly all interpreters, as a completely independent one, "until the completion," as they translate, "and until the judgment will it drop," &c.; but we place it in connexion with the preceding, "over the wing of abomination comes the destroyer, and indeed until," &c. The justification of this connexion lies, in part, in the true interpretation of כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה. For if this can designate only the decree, the final sentence, in antithesis with the smaller chastisement previously decreed, עַד cannot be the *terminus ad quem* of the dropping. The divine punishment does by no means cease with the final sentence, but rather its most fearful expression only then commences. And besides, according to our interpretation, תַּהַךְ retains its entirely natural subject, the final sentence, which is itself represented as dropping down, because with God, decree and execution happen at the same moment, exactly as

it is said, v. 11, "Since the curse and the oath are poured upon us, which is written in the law of Moses," and Mal. 2 : 2, "I send upon you the curse," and as Zech. 5 : 4, "The roll written with the curse comes to the house of the thief, and the false swearer, and destroys it." According to the other interpretation, on the contrary, תַּסַּךְ must be taken impersonally, as it never occurs, and should the less be understood so here, since (v. 11) it stands with the definite subject. That the ו in וְעַד does not disprove our interpretation, since it often stands as the looser connexion, instead of the closer by *et quidem*, thus e. g. in v. 25, וּבְצוֹק, scarcely needs to be remarked; comp. Jer. 15 : 13, Ewald, p. 654, Gesen. p. 845. In like manner the καὶ, John 1, 16, Winer, p. 367. That עַד is not, with Bertholdt, to be interpreted by, "*finally*," is self-evident.

The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, as the type of all future annihilating judgments of God, lies at the foundation of the expression, "it will drop down upon." נָתַךְ is used originally of *natural* rain; comp. 2 Sam. 21 : 10, Exod. 9 : 33. By a *supernatural* rain, however, (comp. Gen. 19 : 24, "and God caused it to *rain* upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone,") the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was effected. This passage of Genesis in a remarkable manner forms the basis of a multitude of others, in which the destruction of the ungodly is described. It is most closely adhered to in Ps. 11 : 6, "God will rain upon the ungodly, cords (not, indeed, "lightnings," which is entirely arbitrary. The image taken from a judicial proceeding; the transgressor is chained before the capital sentence is passed upon him. There is a contrast with the previous independence of the ungodly), fire and brimstone," and Ezek. 38 : 22, "Fire and brimstone will I rain upon him." But the reference is manifest in the following passages, which are more nearly related to the one before us: 2 Chron. 34 : 21, "Great is the rage (lit. *glowing fire*) of the Lord which has poured itself upon us (נִתְּכָה בָנוּ), because our fathers have not observed the word of the Lord, to do according to all that is written in this book." 12 : 7, "And my glowing anger will not drop down תִּתַּךְ, upon Jerusalem." Jer. 7 : 20, "Behold my anger and my fury is poured out, נִתָּכָה, on this place, *over* (as in the passage before us) man and beast and trees of the field, the fruit of the earth, and they turn and are not quenched." 42 : 18, "As my anger and fury has poured itself (נִתַּךְ) *over* the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so will my fury drop down תִּתַּךְ, *over* you, when ye come to Egypt." 44 : 6, "My fury and my anger

(comp. Is. 42 : 25, חֲמַת אַפּוֹ as a composite noun, "his glowing anger,") pours itself, and burns in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, and they become a ruin and desolation;" comp. still, Nah. 1 : 6, Lam. 2 : 4, Is. 42 : 25. From these parallel passages it appears, that the violent rain of the divine anger was the constant designation of the judgment, which caused the destruction of the covenant people, and so usual that it occurred even in the simplest historical prose. Daniel, who had himself, as a contemporary, lived to witness such a rain, (comp. v. 11,) who had even interceded for the awful ruins of the fire, receives here the intelligence, that when they have been rebuilt, and the anger of God shall again be called forth against them, more fearful than before, a new rain of fury will convert them again into ashes and desolation. The expression always implies a total annihilation, and for this reason alone cannot be referred to the time of the Maccabees. In order to evade this unpleasant consequence, recent interpreters, taking שֹׁמֵם actively, divert the glowing anger from the covenant people to their enemies, "*over the destroyer.*" In this, as might easily be supposed, they are not without predecessors among the Jewish interpreters, although these unanimously maintained the reference of the prophecy to the destruction by the Romans. Abarbanel: "*Præterea desolationis meminit adhuc venturæ super ipsas gentes, quæ et ipsa erit usque ad perditionem.*" The choice of this unphilological explanation shows, that no other resource was left, and its refutation therefore is a confession, on the part of the Rationalist interpreters, of the untenableness of their interpretation. The verb שָׁמַם is without exception intransitive, never transitive, "*to destroy.*" We prove this by an examination of all the passages cited in favor of the transitive meaning. Ezek. 36 : 3, יַעַן שֹׁמּוֹת (comp. on this *infin.* form, Ewald, p. 473,) is commonly translated by, "*propterea, quod devastant vos.*" It must, however, rather be translated, "because ye are laid waste, and because they are jealous against you, that ye may become a possession for the heathen." This is undeniably evident from v. 4, where in like manner, as a cause of the active interposition of the divine compassion, first the desolation by the Chaldees is cited, and then the sufferings, which the miserable people had to endure from their haughty neighbours, in like manner as both are constantly united in the complaints of those times. With שֹׁמּוֹת, "the desolate ruins," חֳרָבוֹת שְׁכֻנּוֹת exactly correspond, and "the deserted cities." In the whole prophecy, the wasting of the land of

Israel is never charged upon the surrounding nations, but only cruel scorn and plundering. The desolation is constantly that caused by the Chaldees. An appeal is farther made to Dan. 8: 13, where הַפֶּשַׁע שֹׁמֵם is said to mean, "abomination of the destroyer." But the grammatical objection to this interpretation is so obvious, that Gesenius and Winer have been led thereby to substitute פֶּשַׁע הַשֹּׁמֵם, thus testifying themselves, that they cannot venture to explain according to their view, what *actually* stands in the text. We showed already, p. 364, that we must interpret, "how long endures the vision, that which is constant (the sacred service) and the sin, (the covenant people appear personified as sin; comp. a similar personification Zech. 5: 8, where the Israelitish people is represented as a woman, ungodliness, and also Mal. 1: 4,) as laid waste." The passive interpretation of שֹׁמֵם is required even by הַתָּמִיד. For what would this mean, "how long endures that which is constant," since according to the context, the discourse must relate to the continuance of its abolition? Therefore, "how long endures that which is constant, as a thing laid waste," precisely as in the parallel and explanatory sentence מְרֻמָּס belongs to both, to קֹדֶשׁ, answering to הַתָּמִיד, and to צָבָא, *a host*, a designation of the covenant people, answering to הַפֶּשַׁע. Finally, an appeal is still made, — Is. 42: 14, cited by the older interpreters, is not to be mentioned, because it is now conceded that the form שֹׁמֵם does not there occur, but נָשַׁם, — to Dan. 12: 11, "And from the time that that which is constant is taken away," וְלֶתֶת שִׁקּוּץ שֹׁמֵם, which, — as lastly by Rosenm., — is translated, "and that the desolating abomination is given up," so that the words still belong to the determination of the *terminus a quo*. But this interpretation involves the difficulty, that, according to it, the *terminus ad quem* is entirely wanting, and besides it is difficult not to perceive the manifest antithesis of "they give the abomination as a destroyed," מְשֹׁמֵם, 11: 31. We must, therefore, take the words as a designation of the *terminus ad quem*, "from the time when that which is constant was taken away," and afterwards, "when the abomination is given up, as a thing destroyed," when the abomination, which had been before set up, as author of the desolation, as drawing this after it, according to the law of retribution is now itself laid waste; and as it is said in the parallel passage, 8: 14, "the sanctuary is justified." This interpretation is confirmed by v. 7, where likewise ל stands as a designation of the *terminus ad quem*. — From these remarks, it is evident, that no one, without subjecting

himself to the charge of entire capriciousness, will hereafter translate שֹׁמֵם in the passage before us, by *destroyer*, and especially as the manifest antithesis of מְשֹׁמֵם and שֹׁמֵם, as of the *agens* and the *patiens*, forbids us to identify them, and as the *part.* שֹׁמֵם occurs again in this portion, v. 26, and in the rest of the chapter, also in an intransitive sense.

THE DEFINITENESS OF THE DATES.

The prevailing view in the synagogue and church has ever been, that the 70 weeks, as well as the smaller periods into which they are divided, are accurately determined, and strictly limited. The opposite supposition is liable to suspicion even for being found among those, who had involved themselves in chronological difficulties by false hypothesis, or who had no relish for chronological investigations. Although it is seldom done, yet we must accurately distinguish between an objective and subjective indefiniteness. The latter, which Sack, l. c. p. 291, seems chiefly to assert, when, among other things, he says, "It is one thing to assume an exact coincidence in the view of the divine wisdom, and another to maintain, that this is susceptible of proof," must, in order to its being rendered certain, produce evidence that the chronology of the times from the *terminus a quo* to the *terminus ad quem* is uncertain. As this proof, however, cannot be produced, as the divine wisdom is especially manifest in the circumstance, that the chronological determination of the appearing of the Messiah is first given in a time, in which the chronology, by the comparison, which it is in our power to make of various data and numerous contemporary writers in different nations, rests on the surest foundation, this supposition is to be rejected without farther consideration. In favor of the objective indefiniteness, the supposition that the chronological determination is only given in general, the following arguments have been urged.

1. "It is evident that שָׁבֻעִים, used as a measure of time, is chosen chiefly on account of its similarity in form with the numeral שִׁבְעִים, in the two prophecies of Jeremiah." 2. "It is clear, that the number of these שָׁבֻעִים is made up to 70, for no other reason, than because the absolutely necessary agreement of the 70 years of Jere-

miah required this number, and excluded every other." So Bertholdt, p. 610. It is certainly correct, that the 70 weeks of the restoration stand in a close relation to the 70 years of the desolation. But what follows from this? The *terminus a quo* is so chosen, that such a relation would accurately coincide with the result. Precisely this difference of the *terminus a quo* of the 70 weeks from the *terminus ad quem* of Jeremiah, shows that the time should be accurately determined. 3. Cocceius remarks, "*Non credibile esse, deum voluisse fidem suspendere a chronologia.*" But from the argument which lies at the foundation of this view, we might prove that every translation of Holy Scripture must be inspired. For otherwise would faith depend on philology; in like manner, that all historical inquiries respecting the canonical authority of the biblical writings, would be useless. The argument is no more valid against this prophecy, than against all others whose chronology is determined. If only one such is shown to exist, it is at the same time proved, that the argument must rest on an erroneous principle. Do those, who are unable or unwilling to engage in chronological investigations, receive the less benefit, because regard has been paid to those who are? May they not still enjoy here the same advantage as in the case of the other Messianic prophecies? Are not *all* outward proofs of the divine origin of Christianity to be perceived in an independent manner only by him, who possesses the knowledge necessary for their examination? And can this examination of any one of these proofs be made without a sufficient knowledge? And is not this also required in order to know *about* the time of the fulfilment? And shall we undertake to decide the limit beyond which God must not proceed? Are all proofs of Christianity for all, or has not rather the divine wisdom and love provided, that every one, who will suffer himself to be convinced, shall find them in his own sphere? Need he, who is not at home in any particular department, in which God has left the evidences of his truth, be envious because God is so good? Need any one, e. g., envy the Christian historian, because the proof, from the powerful effects of Christianity, unfolds itself to him far more clearly and fully, than to one, who, in respect to history, is more or less an uneducated man? And, finally, are not the χαρίσματα in the church for the good of the whole? Do not the results, gained by learned investigations, guided by the Spirit of God, and incorporated with the tradition of the church, benefit the unlearned, who embrace them with confidence?

But in proportion to the weakness of the argument *against*, is the strength of those *for*, the definiteness of the chronological dates.

1. The 70 weeks stand in the most exact relation to the 70 years of Jeremiah. The evidence of the chronological definiteness of the latter, applies equally to that of the former. This proof, however, may be easily produced. That Daniel regarded the 70 years as definite, is shown even by his prayer in the 69th. Had there been any doubt on this point, before the fulfilment, still that would have entirely removed it. That the first year of Cyrus is precisely 70 years from the *terminus a quo* of Jeremiah, the 4th year of Jehoiachim, has already been proved in the *Beitr.* I. p. 181. That the Syrian chronology also gives the same result, will be shown in a "*Dissertatio de Tyro a Nebucadnezare capta*," which is soon to appear.

2. All the remaining dates of Daniel concerning the future are definite. That those in chap. 8 and 12, concerning the time of the Maccabees, are so, not merely to the year, but even to the day, is generally conceded. Also the determination of the time of Nebuchadnezzar's madness is proved to be chronologically exact by chap. 4 : 31, "In the end of the (definite) days, although the length of the measure of time must first be determined by the fulfilment."

3. The prophecy itself bears all the marks of chronological definiteness. That this is even indicated by the expression נֶחְתָּךְ, has already been shown in the interpretation. The *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* are not fluctuating, but designated by strictly limited events. The whole period of 70 weeks is not only divided into three parts of 7, 62, and 1 week, but also this latter into two halves. How could this happen, if no regard was paid to half a hundred years, more or less? God himself would have given occasion to doubt his word, if a prophecy, bearing all the marks of chronological definiteness, were proved by the fulfilment to be indefinite.

4. Were the case not completely decided by these arguments, the fulfilment must turn the scale, and an interpretation, which has this on its side, must undoubtedly be the true one.

It is self-evident, that the assertion of this definiteness cannot be extended beyond the limits belonging to the subject itself. It can naturally take place in its full extent, only in respect to those dates, which, as most of those in the prophecy before us, fall in a definite and strictly limited moment. As to events, which are more protracted in their nature, as the completion of the building of the city, and

the subjective appropriation of the blessings obtained through Christ, the definiteness of the prophecy cannot naturally be extended beyond the definiteness of history.

THE *TERMINUS A QUO* OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

We have shown in the exegetical part, that this does not consist in the commencement of the building of the city in general, but rather in that of its finished restoration, according to its ancient extent and ancient dignity. It still remains for us to make out, in an historical way, in what year this date falls.

Were the inquiry merely concerning the commencement of the rebuilding, those would unquestionably be right, who place the *terminus a quo* in the first year of Cyrus. Then would the argument have force, that the returning exiles could not dwell under the open heavens, and that to assert, that under Cyrus nothing was yet done towards the rebuilding of the city, is to make Isaiah, who (45 : 13) praises Cyrus, as its rebuilder, the author of a false prophecy. Who could doubt concerning a fact, which is evinced by every chapter of the sacred Scriptures, which concerns the time from Cyrus to Nehemiah? All these writers, so clearly presuppose the existence of a Jerusalem during this period, that he, who needs to be further argued with, is not worth the trouble.

But as the *terminus a quo* in the prophecy before us is defined, so can it be placed, neither with some in the first year of Cyrus, nor with others in the second year of Darius the son of Hystaspes, nor, lastly, with others, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. *Until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, the new city of Jerusalem was an open, thinly inhabited village, exposed to all aggressions from its neighbours*, sustaining the same relation to the former and the latter city, as the huts erected after the burning of a city, for the first protection from rain and wind, do to those, which are still uninjured, or which have been rebuilt. In the broad space, a few poor dwellings appear among the rubbish, which lies around the city in such heaps, that it is difficult for one to complete the circuit of it.

We first remove the objections, which have been brought against this view of the condition of Jerusalem. In Hag. 1 : 4, it is said,

"Is it a time for you to dwell in your ceiled houses, and my house is laid waste?" But we can no more draw a conclusion from this, as to the condition of the whole city, than we can infer from Is. 1 : 15, ("Your hands are full of blood,") and v. 21, ("Righteousness dwelt in her, but now murderers,") that Jerusalem was entirely filled with murderers. If there were only some ceiled houses, — and who would deny this? — the prophet had sufficient reason, in order to render the antithesis more obvious, to make use of the strongest expressions. An appeal is farther made to Ezra 4 : 12, where the enemies of the Jews write to Artachschasta (Smerdis), "Be it known to the king, that the Jews, who have come from thee to Jerusalem, build the rebellious and wicked city and complete its walls and restore its ruins"; comp. v. 16, "We make known to the king, that when this city is built and its walls completed, thou wilt have no portion on this side of the river." To be sure, if this account came from the author of the book of Ezra, or were found in a letter of the Jews to the Persian king, it would evince, that even soon after the return from exile, and long before Nehemiah, the Jews had at least made an attempt to restore the city to its former state, but at the same time, that this attempt had failed. As it is, however, it proves only, that the enemies of the Jews were gross calumniators. Le Clerc has remarked, "*Hæ vero meræ erant calumniæ. Templum enim solum instaurare cœperant, et domus privatas, in quibus habitarent*"; and that this remark is correct, is evident, because not a word is said before and after of the building of the walls. With exactly the same right as the attempted rebuilding of the walls is here inferred, might it be concluded from Neh. 6 : 6, 7, ("Thou and the Jews, ye think to rebel, — and thou wilt be their king, — also thou hast set up prophets, who shall cry out concerning thee to Jerusalem: king of Judah,") that it was the object of Nehemiah, to shake off the Persian yoke, and make himself king. When the prohibition of the usurper Smerdis, caused by this writing, was repealed by his death, which followed soon after, the building of the temple merely was carried forward under Darius the son of Hystaspes, Ezra 5 : 6. Had the allegations of the enemies been well founded, would not the rebuilding of the walls also have been recommenced? Finally, an appeal is still made to Neh. 1 : 3, "And then they said to me (those, who had come from Jerusalem to the Persian court), those who remain, who are left of the captivity there in the city, are in great affliction and disgrace, and the wall of

Jerusalem is broken down, and her gates burnt with fire." It is asserted, after the example of J. D. Michaelis, that from this it necessarily follows, that the walls of Jerusalem had been rebuilt by those who had returned, and then a second time destroyed by the surrounding nations. For the devastation of Nebuchadnezzar was not unknown to Nehemiah, and could be no new ground of his lamentation. But what necessity is there for supposing, that those who came to Nehemiah announced any thing entirely new? That the walls and gates were not then rebuilt, he knew, indeed, but the bustle of the court had withdrawn his attention from the subject. Now he had a lively sense of the contradiction between the visible appearance and the promise, and he was led thereby to an earnest intercession, which laid the foundation for the removal of this contradiction. The inference is neither better nor worse than that from the impression which the reading of the law made on Josiah, to his former entire unacquaintance with it. Can we conclude, from the circumstance, that, according to Neh. 8 : 9, the people wept, on hearing the law read by Ezra, that they had previously not the least knowledge of it? Besides, "they are in great affliction and disgrace," sustains the relation of effect and cause, to "the walls are destroyed." Nehemiah had never so deeply considered before, that the destruction of the walls would be attended with such ruinous consequences, and so entirely hinder the rebuilding of the city, since it would expose its inhabitants to every species of disgrace and injury from their neighbouring enemies. It appeared to him therefore, now, in an entirely different light, and therefore awakened his sorrow, his intercession, his resolution to render active assistance. That this destruction of the walls and the gates is that by the Chaldeans, and that it continued until the time of Nehemiah, we prove by the following reasons. 1. In a manner entirely similar, the Chaldean devastation, in respect to walls and gates, is described, Lam. 2 : 8, 9, comp. also 2 Kings 25 : 10. 2. The enemies of the Jews know only of *one* long past destruction; comp. Neh. 3 : 34, where Sanballat says, "What do the withered (the feeble) Jews. Will they make the stones alive out of the heaps of rubbish, where they are burnt?" 3. The book of Ezra says not one word of the rebuilding of the walls. And yet it is inconceivable, that an event should have been passed over in silence, the importance of which is evident, since the enemies of the Jews, when it was about to take place, sought to hinder it by cunning and force, and were at nothing more

enraged. From the second part of Zechariah, composed after the sixth year of Darius, (chap. 14 : 10 sq., comp. with several passages of Nehemiah, there cited,) it appears that in the time of both these prophets, the walls and gates were still in precisely the same condition, in which the Chaldeans had left them; that the very same fragments, which they had spared, and no other, were still standing. Comp. further Neh. 3 : 8. "And as they completed (as we must translate on account of the *fut. c. vav. conv.*, which excludes the idea of *plusquamperf.* and on account of v. 34) Jerusalem until the broad wall," from which it appears that there was no occasion to rebuild the broad wall, westward from the gate of Ephraim, which, according to the cited passages, remained standing, (comp. 2 Chron. 26 : 9,) since it still continued, on account of the manner in which it had been strengthened by Uzziah. 5. It is in itself highly improbable, that the Jews, before Nehemiah, even made an attempt to rebuild the walls and gates. In the edict of no Persian king was there even a trace of the permission to do this being given to them. And that this was implied of itself, who would venture to assert? It is a very different thing to suffer a defenceless people to return to their native land, and to supply them with the means of defence, which, in case of a general rebellion, they might use even against the giver himself. The latter presupposes a confidence, which we do not find among the Asiatic monarchs, who well knew that their power depended only on the weakness of their subjects; a confidence which, in this instance, was produced in a very unusual way, only by the near relation which Nehemiah sustained to Artaxerxes. They, however, if they ventured, on their own responsibility, to do what was not permitted, could the less hope for connivance, since they were surrounded by malicious enemies, who sought by every means to awaken the jealousy of the Persian king. If this had already been effected by falsehood, how much more must the Jews expect the worst, if they gave a real ground for complaint, by overstepping the king's command.

This refutation, of what has been urged against the view we have given, of the condition of Jerusalem until the time of Nehemiah, contains, at the same time, in part, the positive proof of it, which, therefore, we need now only to complete.

In Zechariah the condition of Jerusalem appears throughout, a provisional one. In future times, according to v. 16, the measuring line should first be drawn over Jerusalem; the present belongs, ac-

cording to v. 12, still to the period of the affliction, not to that of the restoration; it is still a remnant of the Chaldean servitude. According to chap. 2, the future shall first complete the destruction of Babylon and the building of Jerusalem; nay, what has hitherto taken place, in reference to the latter, is so insignificant, that it does not even come into consideration, that the prophet speaks only as of an entire rebuilding. Comp. especially v. 5, "And see there a man, in his hand a measuring line; and he said, Where goest thou? And he said, To measure Jerusalem, to see how great will be her breadth, and how great her length." Chap. 7 : 7, the past, where Jerusalem was sitting and free, יֹשֶׁבֶת וְשַׁלְוָה, is contrasted with the present. Jerusalem is therefore now still a city, which, לֹא תֵשֵׁב, "sits not, but lies down," comp. on Zech. 9 : 5. Chap. 8 : 5, the prophet promises, that "the streets of the city will hereafter yet be full of boys and girls, playing in them"; and how little there was in the present to justify this promise, appears from the fact, that (v. 6) he finds it necessary to point those to the divine omnipotence, who regarded such a turn of affairs as strange and incredible.

If now, since the book of Ezra furnishes nothing for our purpose, we turn to Nehemiah, the same, if not a still more mournful image, presents itself to our view. That the number of the inhabitants was very small, appears even from the expression, "the remnant, who have remained of the captivity there in the city." It appears to follow from this, that the small number of the inhabitants of Jerusalem had still diminished, in the time between Zechariah and Nehemiah. Weary of the constant oppression of the enemies, who had directed their attention especially to Jerusalem, the people may have scattered themselves over the rest of the land. Especially, however, does chap. 2 : 3 and 5, show the absurdity of placing the restoration of the city in the time before Nehemiah. Nehemiah there says to Artaxerxes, "The city, where the graves of my fathers are, lies waste, חָרְבָה, and its gates are burnt with fire. — Send me to Judea, to the city of the graves of my fathers, that I may build it," וְאֶבְנֶנָּה. It hence appears, that the difference of the condition of Jerusalem then, from its condition during the exile, was so small as to be entirely overlooked, and the former could be described, just as the latter is, e. g., in the chapter before us. That Nehemiah did not perhaps exaggerate before the king of Persia, appears from v. 17, where, in Jerusalem itself, he describes the condition of the city in the same manner; "Ye see the affliction in which we are; Jerusalem

is laid waste, and her gates burnt with fire." Very significant also is Neh. 7 : 4; "The city was wide and great, and only a few people in it, and there were no houses built." This passage refers to the time immediately after the completion of the walls of the city. In reliance on the divine promise, they had given to them their ancient circumference; now, however, there was the most striking disproportion between the extent of the city and the amount of what it contained. The few houses seemed in the broad space entirely to vanish.

We have hitherto shown, that the beginning of the restoration of the city cannot be placed before the time of Nehemiah; we now show that it was made by him. That at a later period he was regarded as the rebuilder, not only of the walls and gates, but also of the city itself, appears from Jes. Sir. 49, 13: *Νεεμίου ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ μνημόσυνον, τοῦ ἐγείραντος ἡμῖν τείχη πεπτωκότα καὶ στήσαντος πύλας καὶ μοχλούς, καὶ ἀνεγείραντος τὰ οἰκόπεδα ἡμῶν.* Joshua and Zerubbabel, on the contrary, are extolled (v. 12) only as rebuilders of the temple. Still we can produce a far stronger proof from Nehemiah himself. In close connexion with chap. 7 : 4, which is interrupted only by the relation of what happened between the purpose and its execution, Nehemiah relates, chap. 11 : 1, 2, what he did in order to increase the population of Jerusalem. By his influence, all the heads of the people, in the first place, removed from the country into the city; then a tenth part of all the rest of the people, according to lot, were compelled to do the same. And, finally, a large number of families voluntarily removed from the country into the city. This, which at first, on account of the sudden disruption of all relations which it involves, appears as a sacrifice, arising from a Theocratical disposition, must afterwards have frequently happened in the case of those, who were not led by such a motive. Jerusalem, as the only fortified city of the land, possessed such an advantage, that every one, whose circumstances would in any measure allow it, would be induced to choose it for his residence. The building of the walls of Jerusalem, and "there shall be no more reproach," are placed as connected with each other, Neh. 2 : 17. Partly for this reason, and partly because Jerusalem was the seat of the sanctuary, no one of the Jews, who still continued to return from their dispersion, would readily fix his dwelling-place elsewhere. Many would certainly be induced to return, precisely on account of the intelligence of the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

How prosperously and rapidly the city henceforth advanced, while in the long period from the first year of Cyrus to Nehemiah, it had made no progress, will be apparent from the passages of heathen writers, hereafter to be cited.

If, now, we seek to determine still more accurately the *terminus a quo*, we find it to be the prayer of Nehemiah, for the restoration of the city; chap. 1. In consequence of the hearing of this prayer, the divine decree for the rebuilding of the city went forth; and, indeed, this is given in v. 25 as the *terminus a quo* of the 70 weeks. To the hearing of this prayer, Nehemiah (comp. chap. 2 : 8, 18.)* refers all that follows, particularly the favorable audience that Artaxerxes gave him. This prayer, however, falls in the month Chisleu, in the third month of the civil year, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, from the time of whose reign, therefore, in the chronological reckoning of the 70 weeks, we have to subtract only 19 complete years, and then we have the *terminus a quo* of Daniel's prophecy.

We must still examine some objections, which have been brought against the *terminus a quo* assumed by us, after the example in general of the most and best interpreters, as well as that of Jul. Africanus in Jerome, who, on the whole, perceived the truth in reference to the prophecy, only he calculated according to lunar years.† 1. "Daniel must necessarily have been living at the time of the edict, which is here spoken of, otherwise it could not serve to console him, and he would not have known where he should begin to reckon; his own prophecy, therefore, would have been to him unintelligible." Thus Hassencamp, *Ueber die* 70 *Wochen*, p. 9, ff. But this objection proceeds on the erroneous assumption, that all was then imparted to Daniel merely for himself, while, according to the correct view, he was only an organ, by which God made disclosures, which in part could not be understood in their whole extent till centuries afterwards. We say according to the *correct* view. For it is that which lies in the book of Daniel itself. The vision, chap. 8, shall be shut up, according to v. 26, until a far

* Bengel, *Ordo Temp.* p. 346, "Mandata regum (ἐξιλασθέντα ῥήματα, ut habet phrasis Luc. 2, 1) illi verbo subserviebant."

† A mode of reckoning, which, as it is never found among the Hebrews, is so entirely destitute of all ground, that we need not stop to refute it; comp. in opposition, Vitringa, l. c. p. 260; Frank, *Syst. Chronolog.* I. 1. § 8., Ideler, *Chronologie*, I. p. 490, ff.

distant time of fulfilment. Daniel himself wonders at this, v. 27, and no man understands it. According to chap. 12, v. 4, the whole preceding prophecy is sealed up until the time of the end; then will many investigate it, and great will be the agreement. Chap. 12 : 7, the angel gives a determination of time. Daniel hears it and understands it not, and prays the angel for clearer discoveries, v. 8. He answers, v. 9, that he cannot impart these to him, because the prophecy is shut up and sealed until the last time; comp. on this passage, *Beitr.* I. p. 215, ff. In especial reference to the last cited passage, it is said, 1 Pet. 1 : 10 – 12, "The prophets have inquired and searched," in reference to the future salvation. It was, however, revealed to them, that the prophecy, given through their instrumentality, was not destined for them, but for those living at the time of the fulfilment. Daniel need not know where he should begin to reckon; it was sufficient if he could only infer from the prophecy itself, that he need not yet begin, that the *terminus a quo* had not yet arrived. The accurate reckoning belonged only to those of a later period, and even for these there remained, before the fulfilment, so much darkness, (partly on account of the method of determining the *terminus a quo* itself, where, as in all the rest of the prophecy, the effort is obvious, to avoid on the one hand objective indefiniteness, and on the other such clearness, for those who lived before the fulfilment, as would have converted the prophecy into a history, and partly on account of the absence of an accurate chronological investigation of the whole period, as it is manifest even in Josephus,) that they must content themselves with ascertaining from the prophecy *about* the time of the appearing of Christ; and that this has actually been accomplished, in respect to the more intelligent, can be historically proved. A *subjective* insight into the prophecy, corresponding to its *objective* definiteness, was reserved for the times after the fulfilment. — The assertion however is erroneous, that, this *terminus a quo* being assumed, the prophecy could have afforded to Daniel no consolation. Was not then the *that* of itself a rich source of comfort? And then Daniel was not entirely uncertain as to the *when*. The *when* of the return from the exile was accurately known to him. He was aware that only two years were yet to elapse. Cyrus, who was to accomplish it, was already on the stage of history. That the return, however, could not be separated from the finished restoration by a long series of years, seemed to lie in the nature of the case. The prediction might be the more consoling to Daniel,

because he supposes both to be much nearer to each other than they really were. That he actually did this, can, perhaps, be inferred from the deep sorrow, which, according to chap. 10, he expresses, when, in the third year of Cyrus, the rebuilding of the Theocracy met with an unexpected hinderance; comp. *Beitr.* A more accurate determination of the period between the *terminus ad quem* of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and the *terminus a quo* of that before us, would only have served to dishearten those who were returning, or entirely to prevent them from coming back; in favor of which, without any such object, so few comparatively decided.

2. "*Quanta erat calamitas, tantum beneficii exoptabatur et promittebatur. Uno tempore templum et urbem vastarant Chaldæi; in ruinis et templum et urbs jacebant, quum Daniel oraret; quare uti prædictio vastitatis Jerem.* 21 : 10, *etc., sic descriptio vastitatis et ædificationis sub urbis mentione templum quoque innuit. Hinc omnia Daniel precibus complectebatur, urbem, montem sanctum, populum, sanctuarium. Eademque omnia complectitur responsio per angelum allata.*" Bengel, *Ordo Tempor.* p. 343. But all this proves nothing more, than that in the divine disclosure, the temple also must be considered. This appears also indirectly, since in the beginning of the 70 weeks, or of the restoration of the city, it is presupposed as already completed. For how could the city, without the temple, be well called the holy city? The prediction of the destruction of the temple also, after the end of the 70 weeks, presupposes that it had been rebuilt. But to assert, that the rebuilding of the temple and the city must necessarily happen at the same time, is the same as to say, that the historical facts must be different from what they are. If both events are really separated from each other, why also in the prophecy should not one of them merely be placed as the *terminus a quo?* And, indeed, that, from which the 70 weeks of years being reckoned, they received at the definite *terminus ad quem* their completion.

To the investigation of this *terminus a quo*, we here subjoin that respecting the historical confirmation of what is given, as *properly* belonging to the first period; the 7 weeks beginning with this *terminus a quo*. The restoration of the city shall extend entirely through it, and be completed with its termination. This falls, — and, as will hereafter be shown, the twentieth year of Artaxerxes is the year 455 before Christ, — in the year 406, two years before the end of the nineteenth year of the reign of Darius the Second, the suc-

cessor of Artaxerxes. And here, in reference to the demonstration of the agreement of prophecy and fulfilment, we must speak with modesty, partly on account of the nature of the object, which is not one accurately defined and limited, partly on account of the extreme deficiency of our records of this period, since Josephus passes over it in total silence. These modest expectations, however, we are able in an unexpected way to surpass.

The most remarkable testimony is furnished by Herodotus, whose history cannot have been composed before the year 408, because he relates events which fell in this year and the preceding, comp. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, p. 85, and especially Dahlmann, *Forschungen*, I. p. 98, ff.; and not much later, because otherwise quite too great an age would be attributed to him. What he says, therefore, respecting the greatness of Jerusalem, can tolerably well be applied to the time of the end of the 7 weeks. We must, indeed, allow to ourselves an assumption, the proof of which must be reserved for another place, viz. that the *Kadytis* of Herodotus is Jerusalem. But we venture to do this the more readily since the case speaks for itself, and since the former learned vindications of this opinion, as that by Lightfoot (*Opp. t.* II. p. 408), by Prideaux (I. p. 106 sq.), by Cellarius (3, 13, ed. Schwarz, II. p. 456), by Heine (*Observv. sacræ*, lib. I. c. 5, p. 63), by the acute author of the *Observatio de Cadyti, magna Syriæ urbe* (in the *nova var. script. coll. fasc.* I. Halle, 1716), by Zorn (on *Hecatæus Abder.* p. 94), by Dahlmann (*Forschungen*, II. p. 75), are by no means refuted by the treatise of Hitzig, and since after him Niebuhr, also, (in the first volume of the *hist. phil. Schriften, Abhandlung über die Armen. Chronik des Eusebius*,) and Bähr (*Herodoti Musæ*, I. p. 922,) have joined these defenders. Herodotus speaks of *Kadytis* in two places. The former (2, 159, *μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην Κάδυτιν, πόλιν τῆς Συρίης ἐοῦσαν μεγάλην εἶλε*) refers, indeed, to the time before the exile, to the capture of Jerusalem by Pharaoh Necho, after Josiah had fallen in the battle of Megiddo. But yet Herodotus describes Jerusalem as a city which, even in his time, was still great. But more important is the second passage, 3, 5: *ἀπὸ γὰρ Φοινίκης μέχρι οὔρων τῶν Καδύτιος πόλιος, ἥ ἐστι Σύρων τῶν Παλαιστινῶν καλεομένων· ἀπὸ δὲ Καδύτιος, ἐούσης πόλιος (ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκέει) Σαρδίων οὐ πολλῷ ἐλάσσονος, κ. τ. λ.* That the predicate "great," in the former, is to be taken in its full sense, is evident from the comparison with Sardis; this very ancient city had also retained, under the Persian dominion and later, the greatness and

population, which it had formerly possessed, as a residence of the Lydian kings. This appears, among other sources, from Pausanias, *Lacon.* p. 175, ed. Wech.: *Ἦν γὰρ δὴ τῆς Ἀσίας τῆς κάτω μέγιστον μέρος τηνικαῦτα ἡ Λυδία, καὶ αἱ Σάρδεις πλούτῳ τε καὶ παρασκευῇ προεῖχον· τῷ τε σατραπεύοντι ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ τοῦτο οἰκητήριον ἀπεδέδεικτο, καθάπερ γε αὐτῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ Σοῦσα.* Pliny designates (Hist. Nat. 5, 29, "*Celebratur maxime Sardibus,*") this city as the ornament of all Lydia; Strabo, p. 625, as one of great antiquity and extent; and the last predicate is so constantly given to it (comp. also Ovid, *Metam.* 11, 137. "*Vade, ait ad* MAGNIS *vicinum Sardibus amnem*"), that it seems to have been a standing epithet.

Another testimony, belonging indeed to a later period, but not less remarkable on that account, is that of Hecatæus Abderita, a writer of the time of Alexander and Ptolemy Lagus, (comp. concerning him, *Beitr.*, I. p. 281,) in a fragment in Joseph. lib. I. c. Ap. § 22, and in Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* lib. IX. c. 4: *ἔστι γὰρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὰ μὲν πολλὰ ὀχυρώματα κατὰ τὴν χώραν καὶ κῶμαι· μία δὲ πόλις ὀχυρά, πεντήκοντα μάλιστα σταδίων τὴν περίμετρον· ἣν οἰκοῦσι μὲν ἀνθρώπων περὶ δώδεκα μυριάδες, καλοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν Ἱεροσόλυμα,* on which Scaliger remarks, "*Vides, quanta fuerit Hieros. urbs, quam totius Orientis ornamentum vere vocare poterant tempore Hecatæi.*"

As a special characteristic of the restoration, to take place in the 7th week, it is mentioned in the prophecy that it would happen in a troublesome time, *in angustia et pressura temporum.* This also exactly coincides with the result. One cannot sufficiently wonder, how the divine blessing, concealed beneath the cross, could still be so efficacious, that, in a comparatively short time, in place of a heap of rubbish, a city should arise, inferior in greatness to few in Asia. How entirely suitable to the commencement of this period was the predicate of a time of distress, is evident from Neh. chap. 4. Harassed by surrounding enemies, the builders were obliged to carry arms in one hand, while they labored with the other; their strength, exhausted by the labors of the day, was again called into requisition by watching at night. And, even after the completion of the building, the affliction and toil still continued. This appears from the lively description, Neh. 9: 36, 37, "Behold we are still servants, and the land that thou hast given to our fathers, to eat its fruit and its good things, behold we are servants in it. And, it gives its increase for the kings, whom thou hast set over us, on account of our sins, and they reign over our bodies, and over our cattle, according

to their pleasure, and in great distress, בָּצָרָה נָרֹלָה, are we." Of this also the prophecies of Malachi, which belong to the period, afford a clear proof. He has perpetually to contend with those who murmur against God, on account of the distressing condition of the new colony, and were in danger of being led thereby to total unbelief.

CHRONOLOGICAL DETERMINATION OF THE *TERMINUS AD QUEM.*

THE extreme *terminus ad quem* of the prophecy, the period at which the forgiveness of sins, the imparting of the everlasting righteousness, &c. should be completed, falls in the end of the 70 weeks. It is, however, erroneous to lay this as the foundation of the chronological reckoning, because it is designated by no single, accurately limited fact. Such an one on the contrary we find, however, in the close of the 69th week; and we adopt this *terminus ad quem*, the public appearing of Christ, his anointing with the gifts of the Spirit, more readily as the ground of our calculation, since, which is very remarkable, in the history of the fulfilment it appears also designated with the same chronological exactness, as here in the prophecy; more accurately, indeed, than any other point, as the birth, or the resurrection, or the ascension of Christ.

We read, Luke 3 : 1, *ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου καίσαρος, ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, — ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην.* According to this the public appearing of John the Baptist and of Christ falls in the year 782 U. C. An attempt has indeed been made on different grounds, partly to rescue the authority of several fathers, whose dates differ from this, partly in order to unsettle the firm historical grounds of the sacred history, to render this determination useless. But with very little success. For when Paulus and Kuinöl, e. g., remark, that it is uncertain what mode of reckoning of the years of Tiberius is here employed, Ideler (*Chronologie*, I. p. 418,) has already proved, in opposition, that history in general knows no other mode than that from the beginning of his actual reign, after the death of Augustus; and when they assert, that Luke determines only the year in which John, not that in which Christ publicly came forward, it is left out of view, that even the accurate deter-

mination of the time of the appearing of John, and the immediate connexion of the appearing of Christ therewith, without a new date, shows that both fall in the same year. Bengel has well remarked: "*Certe non id egit Lucas, ut, introitu præcursoris exacte notato, initium ab ipso domino factum nonnisi obiter tangeret, sed præcipuam posterioris curam habuit. Opportune tamen Johannem conjungit, ne longiori intervallo præcessisse credatur.*" To the coincidence of the appearance of both in the same year, — perhaps separated by the period of six months, — we are also led by καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος, in v. 23. If we interpret, "also Jesus himself," it follows that John, also, at his entrance on his office (ἀρχόμενος) was about thirty years old, and of course, since John was only six months older than Christ, that he came forward only six months earlier. If we translate, "and Jesus *himself*," then it is presupposed, even by this reference to John, that the preceding designation of time in the history of the world is here also to be supplied, and that it only receives an addition through the mention of the age of Christ; which, again, as it was not accidental, that Christ did not enter upon his office until the completion of his thirtieth year, but in accordance with the legal appointments of the Old Testament, which were also applicable to John, settles likewise the age of the latter. Entirely without meaning is the objection against the coincidence of the year of Christ and of John, which has been deduced from v. 21 compared with Matt. 3 : 5. For, had the extent of Judea been ten times as great, yet, such was the general excitement, and religious intercourse carried on by means of the capital, a period of about half a year would have been completely sufficient to awaken the attention of the whole land. Finally, the opinion of Sanclemente, cited by Ideler, l. c. p. 419, that the determination of time does not refer to the appearance of John and of Christ, but to the sufferings and death of the latter, does not, as Ideler supposes, deserve, previous to its rejection, a thorough examination before the tribunal of the critics, but is a fit subject for Turkish justice.

THE AGREEMENT OF PROPHECY AND FULFILMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE DISTANCE OF THE *TERMINUS A QUO* FROM THE *TERMINUS AD QUEM.*

According to the prophecy, the *terminus a quo*, the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, is separated from the *terminus ad quem*, the public appearance of Christ, by a period of 69 weeks of years, or four hundred eighty-three years. If, now, we compare history with this, it must appear, even to the most prejudiced, in the highest degree remarkable, that among all the current chronological determinations of this period, not one differs over ten years from the testimony of the prophecy. This wonder must rise to the highest pitch, when it appears from an accurate examination of these determinations, that the only one among them, which is correct, makes the prophecy and history correspond with each other, even to a year.

Happily, to attain this end, we are not compelled to involve ourselves in a labyrinth of chronological inquiries. We find ourselves, in the main, on sure ground. All chronologists agree, that the commencement of the reign of Xerxes falls in the year 485 before Christ, the death of Artaxerxes, in the year 423. The difference concerns only the year of the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes. Our problem is completely solved, when we have shown that this falls in the year 474 before Christ. For then the twentieth year of Artaxerxes is the year 455 before Christ, according to the usual reckoning,* = 299 U. C.

Add to this, 483 years.

782 U. C.

We should probably have been saved the trouble of this investigation, had not the error of an acute man, and the want of independence in his successors, darkened what was in itself clear. According to Thucydides, Artaxerxes began to reign shortly before the flight of Themistocles to Asia. Deceived by certain specious arguments, hereafter to be examined, Dodwell, in the *Annall. Thucyd.*,

* The intelligent reader will perceive that the author has intentionally made his investigation entirely independent of the difficult inquiries respecting the year of the birth of Christ, which, in his judgment, have in recent times, by the introduction of uncertain astronomical combinations, particularly by Münter and Ideler, been led far astray.

placed both events in the year 465 before Christ. The thorough refutation of Vitringa, in the cited treatise, remained, strange as it may appear, unknown to the philologians and historians, even as it seems to those of Holland, as Wesseling. The view of Dodwell, adopted also by Corsini in the *Fasta Attica*, became the prevailing one, at which we cannot wonder, when we consider how seldom, in modern times, chronological investigations in general have been fundamental and independent; when, e. g., we observe that Poppo, a generally esteemed recent editor of Thucydides, in a thick volume entitled *in Thucydidem Commentarii politici, geograph., chronologici*, furnishes, in reference to the last, nothing more than a reprint of the school edition of the chronological tables collected from Dodwell, excusing himself with an *odio quodam inveterato totius hujus disciplinæ!* Clinton also (*Fasti Hellenici, lat. vert. Krügcr*, Leipz., 1830), though he clearly perceives, that Dodwell has confused the whole chronology of this period (comp., e. g., pp. 248 – 253), has not been able to free himself from him in the most important points, though he successfully opposed him in several; and thus the confusion only becomes still greater, since now neither the actual chronological succession of events, nor the one ingeniously invented by Dodwell, any longer remains. Nevertheless, the truth is advanced by this increased confusion. For now the harmony introduced by Dodwell into the fictitious history is destroyed. The honor, however, of having again discovered the true path, belongs to Krüger alone, who, after more than a hundred years, as an entirely independent inquirer, coincides with Vitringa, in the same result, and in part in the employment of the same arguments. In the acute treatise, *Ueber den Cimonischen Frieden*, (in the *Archiv f. Philologie und Pädagog. von Seebode*, I. 2. p. 205, ff.,) he places the death of Xerxes in the year 474 or 473, and the flight of Themistocles a year later. This treatise may serve to shame those, who reject in the mass the grounds of our opinion, (to the establishment of which we now proceed,) with the remark, that the author has only found what he sought. Whoever does not feel capable of entering independently upon the investigation, should at least be prevented from condemning, by the circumstance, that a learned man, who has no other design in view, than to elucidate a chronologically confused period of Grecian history, gives, for the event which serves to determine the *terminus a quo* of our prophecy, the precise year, which places prophecy and fulfilment in the most exact harmony.

We examine first the grounds which seem to favor the opinion, that the reign of Artaxerxes commenced in the year 465. 1. "The flight of Themistocles must precede the transfer of the dominion of Greece from Athens to Sparta by several years. For this happened during the siege of Byzantium, when the treasonable efforts of Pausanias first commenced; the flight of Themistocles, however, was a consequence of the complaint, which was raised against him, out of the documents found after the death of Pausanias. But Isocrates says, in the *Panathenaikos*, that the dominion of the Lacedemonians had endured ten years. The expedition of Xerxes taken as the *terminus a quo*, this transfer falls in the year 470." But we may spare ourselves the labor, which Vitringa takes, to invalidate this alleged testimony of Isocrates, since all recent scholars, in part independent of one another, agree that Isocrates speaks of a ten years' dominion, not before, but after that of the Athenians; comp. Coray, on *Pan.* c. 19. Dahlmann, *Forschungen*, I. p. 45. Krüger, p. 221. Clinton, p. 250, ff. 2. That Themistocles in the year 472 was still in Athens, Corsini infers (*Fasti Att.* III. p. 180) from *Æl.* lib. 9. c. 5. According to this, Themistocles sent back Hiero, who was coming to the Olympic games, asserting, that, whoever had not taken part in the greatest danger, could not be a sharer of the joy. (The fact is also related by Plutarch.) Now, as Hiero Ol. 75, 3 (478) began to reign, only the Ol. 77 (472) could be intended. But who does not at once perceive, that the reference to the games of the Ol. 76 (476) was far more obvious, since the occurrence presupposed that the *μέγιστος τῶν κινδύνων* was still fresh in remembrance? 3. According to this supposition, Xerxes would reign only eleven years; Artaxerxes, on the contrary, fifty-one. This is in opposition to the testimony of the *Can. Ptolem.* (comp. thereon Ideler, I. p. 109, ff.), which gives to Xerxes twenty-one, and to Artaxerxes forty-one years; and of Ctesias, who gives to Artaxerxes forty-two years, and of some other writers; compare the passages in Bähr on *Ctesias*, p. 184. *Ceteris paribus*, this argument would be wholly decisive. But when other weighty authorities are opposed to it, it is not of itself sufficient to outweigh them. The canon has high authority, only where it rests on astronomical observations, which is here not the case. Otherwise it stands on the same ground as all other historical sources. The whole error was committed, as soon as only an *ιά* in an ancient authority was confounded with a *κά*; for when a reign of twenty-one years had thus been attributed to Xerxes, the shortening of the reign

of Artaxerxes to forty-one years, necessarily followed. Wesseling (on *Diod.* 12, 64,) attributes forty-five years to Artaxerxes, thus without hesitation rejecting the authority of the canon. — To these arguments, already adduced by others, we subjoin the following. 4. It seems to be evident from Ctesias, chap. 20, that Artaxerxes was born a considerable time after the commencement of the reign of Xerxes. Ctesias, after relating it, proceeds: *γαμεῖ δὲ Ξέρξης Ὁνόφα θυγατέρα Ἀμιστρίν καὶ γίνεται αὐτῷ παῖς Δαρειαῖος, καὶ ἕτερος μετὰ δύο ἔτη Ῥοτάσπης, καὶ ἔτι Ἀρταξέρξης.* If he relates the events in the true chronological order, Artaxerxes in the year 474 could at most have been seven years old. On the contrary, however, all accounts agree, that at the death of Xerxes, although still young, (comp. Justin, 3, 1,) he was yet of a sufficient age to be capable of reigning himself. We must not be satisfied with the answer, that it is very improbable that Xerxes, who was born at the beginning of the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Darius, (comp. Herod. 7, 2,) and was already 34 – 35 years old at his death, was not married until so late a period. Ctesias himself frees us from the embarrassment into which we were thrown by his inaccuracy. According to chap. 22, Megabyzus was already married, before the expedition against Greece, with a daughter of Xerxes, who, already mentioned, chap. 20, if Ctesias is there chronologically accurate, could not have been born before that time. According to chap. 28, Megabyzus, immediately after the return of Xerxes from Greece, complained to him of the shameful conduct of this wife of his. 5. There can be no doubt that the Ahasuerus of the book of Esther, is the same as Xerxes. But the twelfth year of this king is there expressly mentioned, chap. 3: 7, and the events related in the following context fall, in part, about the end of the same year. But this difficulty vanishes, as soon as we include the years of the co-regency of Xerxes with Darius. According to the full account in Herodot. 7. chap. 2 – 4, Xerxes, two years before the death of Darius, was established by him, as king, comp. e. g. chap. 4.: *ἀπέδεξε δὲ βασιλῆα Πέρσῃσι Δαρεῖος Ξέρξεα.* Of the custom of the Hebrew writers to include the years of a co-regency, where it existed, we have a remarkable example in the account concerning Nebuchadnezzar (comp. Beitr. I. p. 63). But we find even in the book of Esther itself, plain indications of this mode of reckoning. The account of the great feast, chap. 1, is placed in its true light by this supposition. The occasion of it was the *actual* commencement of the reign of Xerxes, though we need not on this

account exclude, what has hitherto been regarded as the exclusive object, consultations with the nobles respecting the expeditions about to be undertaken. What is related, chap. 2 : 16, then falls precisely in the time of the return of Xerxes from Greece, while otherwise, and this is attended with difficulty, about two years after that event.

We now proceed to lay down the positive grounds for our view; and in the first place, the immediate, and then the mediate proofs, which latter are far more numerous and strong, since they show, that the flight of Themistocles, which must precede the reign of Artaxerxes, cannot possibly be placed later than 473 before Christ.

To the first class, belong the following. 1. It must appear very strange to those, who assume a twenty-one years' reign of Xerxes, that the whole period from the eleventh year, is a complete *tabula rasa*. The biblical accounts stop short at the close of the tenth year. Ctesias relates only one inconsiderable event after the Grecian war, chap. 28, which occurred immediately after its termination. No later writer has ventured to introduce any thing into the ten years, which, according to our view, the permutation of an ι and κ adds to his age.

2. We possess a twofold testimony, which places the return of Xerxes from Greece, and his death, in so close connexion, that, without rejecting it, we cannot possibly assume a fifteen years' reign after this return, but are rather compelled to place his death not beyond the year 474. The first is that of Ælian, *Var. Hist.* 13, 3: *εἶτα ἐπανελθὼν, αἴσχιστα ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανεν, ἀποσφαγεὶς νύκτωρ ἐν τῇ εὐνῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ.* The second, that of Justin, 3, 1. "*Xerxes rex Persarum, terror antea gentium, bello in Græciam infeliciter gesto, etiam suis contemtui esse cœpit. Quippe Artabanus præfectus ejus, deficiente quotidie regis majestate, in spem regni adductus, cum septem robustissimis filiis,*" etc.

3. The testimonies of Justin, l. c., respecting the age of his sons at his death, are not reconcilable with the twenty-one years' reign of Xerxes. "*Securior de Artaxerxe, puero admodum, fingit regem a Dario, qui erat* adolescens, *quo maturius regno potiretur, occisum.*" If Xerxes reigned twenty-one years, his first-born, Darius, according to a comparison of Ctesias, chap. 22, could not at his death have been an *adolescens*, but at least thirty-one years old. On the contrary, if eleven years' reign be assumed, these determinations are entirely suitable. Darius was then towards twenty-one years old: Artaxerxes, according to Ctesias, chap. 20, near four years younger

than Darius, about seventeen. This determination shows also, that it cannot be objected against a fifty-one years' reign of Artaxerxes, that it would give him too great an age. The suggestion can be refuted by the simple remark, that the length of his life remains exactly the same, whether he reigned fifty-one or forty-one years. If he ascended the throne at seventeen, his life terminated at sixty-eight.

4. According to the most numerous and weighty testimonies, the peace of Cimon was probably concluded after the battle of the Eurymedon (before Christ 470). Now as all agree that this peace was concluded with Artaxerxes, the commencement of his reign must, in any event, be placed before 470. Comp. Krüger, l. c. p. 218.

5. The history of Nehemiah is scarcely reconcilable with the supposition, that Artaxerxes reigned only forty-seven years. After Nehemiah had accomplished all that is related in chap. 1 – 12 of his book, he returned to Persia to discharge the duties of his office, at court. This happened according to 13 : 6, in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes. The time of his return is not accurately determined. It says merely, after a considerable time, the לְקֵץ יָמִים. That his absence, however, must have continued a whole series of years, appears from the relation of that which took place in the mean time. The law against marriage with foreign women, to the observance of which the people had bound themselves anew, chap. 10 : 30, was first violated during his absence; then again by a decree of the people, executed in all severity, 13 : 1 – 3, and then again broken, as appears from the fact, that Nehemiah, at his return, according to v. 23, found a great many foreign women in the colony. That these marriages had already existed for some time, appears from v. 24, where it is said, that the children of them had spoken half in the language of Ashdod, and could not speak Hebrew. A long absence is also implied in the other abuses which Nehemiah, according to chap. 13 : 10 sq., found on his return. He saw the fruits of the former labors almost destroyed. The same is also evident from the prophecies of Malachi, which were delivered exactly in the time between the two periods of Nehemiah's presence at Jerusalem; comp. Vitringa's excellent *Dissert. de Ætate Mal.*, in his *Obss. ss.* VI. 7. t. 2. p. 353 sq. The condition of the people appears here, as it could have been only after they had already been deprived, for a considerable time, of their two faithful leaders, Ezra, who, having arrived thirteen years earlier, had coöperated for a considerable time with Nehemiah, and Nehemiah himself. But, if we consider barely the

first-mentioned fact, the marriages with foreign women, it will be evident, that a longer period than nine years would be required. For each change, there will then only three years be allowed, and as this is undeniably too little for the third, according to v. 24, the two first must be still more shortened, which is inadmissible. Besides, we do not even have nine years for these events, if the reign of Artaxerxes is fixed at forty-one years. For the relation of Nehemiah presupposes, that Artaxerxes was yet living at the time of its composition. This, however, cannot be placed in the time immediately after the return of Nehemiah, since it must have been preceded by the abolition of all these abuses. If, however, we are conducted by the authority of Nehemiah, which is liable to no exception, since he was contemporary, and closely connected with Artaxerxes, a few years over forty-one, we have gained much. For then the only objection to our determination, the testimony of the canon, is completely set aside.

We must premise a remark, before we bring forward our indirect proofs, in order to justify the connexion, in which we place the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes with the flight of Themistocles. This connexion has not, indeed, the unanimous testimony of the ancient writers in its favor. The vouchers for it are, Thucydides, chap. 137, where it is said of Themistocles, who had come into Asia, *ἐσπέμπει γράμματα ἐς βασιλέα Ἀρταξέρξην τὸν Ξέρξου, νεωστὶ βασιλεύοντα*, and Charon of Lampsacus, who, according to Plutarch, *Them.* chap. 27, makes him in like manner fly to Artaxerxes. On the contrary, others, as Ephorus, Dinon, Klitarch, and Heraclides (comp. Plut. l. c.), represent him as going to Xerxes. If, now, we examine these testimonies, according to the authority of the witnesses, the decision will unquestionably be in favor of that of Thucydides and Charon. Thucydides was contemporary with Artaxerxes, and was born about the time of the flight of Themistocles. This prince of Greek historians gives, chap. 97, as the cause, why he relates the events between the Median and Peloponnesian war, that all his predecessors had passed over these events in silence, and that the only one who touched upon them, Hellanicus, *βραχέως τε καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐπεμνήσθη* them, from which it is evident, first, how little certain are the accounts of this period in later authors, because they can have no credible contemporary voucher, since he could not have been unknown to Thucydides; and second, that Thucydides himself claims to be regarded as a careful and accurate historian of this

period, and therefore must be esteemed such, because so honest a man would assume nothing to himself, which did not belong to him. The other witness, Charon, was the less liable to err, since, at the very time of this event, he was a writer of history, and even lived in Asia. On the other hand, the oldest witnesses for the opposite supposition, lived more than a century after the event. Ephorus (see on his *Akrisie*, Dahlmann) outlived the dominion of Alexander in Asia; Dinon was father of Klitarch, who accompanied Alexander.

In weighing these grounds, the authority of Thucydides and Charon was unhesitatingly followed in ancient times. Plutarch, l. c. does this, with the remark, that the testimony of Thucydides agrees better with the chronological works. Nepos says: "*Scio plerosque ita scripsisse, Themistoclem Xerxe regnante in Asiam transiisse: sed ego potissimum Thucydidi credo, quod ætate proximus de his, qui illorum temporum historias reliquerunt et ejusdem civitatis fuit.*" Suidas, and the Scholiast on *Aristoph. Equites*, from which the former borrowed *verbatim* his second article on Themistocles, makes him flee, *πρὸς τὸν Ἀρταξέρξην, τὸν Ξέρξου τοῦ Ἱέρσου παῖδα*, without even mentioning the other supposition. And in this respect, we have the less fear of contradiction, since, as far as we know, all modern critics, without exception, follow Thucydides and Charon. We only still remark, that the opposite view can the more easily be rejected, since its origin can so readily be explained, either from the fact, that this event fell on the border of the reign of Xerxes and of Artaxerxes, or from a simple confounding of the two names, the assumption of which is more easy, the more frequently it occurs; we find it even in Aristotle, the contemporary of those writers, *Pol.* 5, 8, and twice in Ctesias, chap. 35, where Bähr would make a change in opposition to all the manuscripts, and chap. 44. Comp. Bähr on the passage, and Reimarus on *Dio Cass.* II. p. 1370. Finally, the error might arise also from the circumstance, that the flight of Themistocles was placed in the right year, but twenty-one years were attributed to Xerxes, from which it necessarily follows, that he took refuge with Xerxes. This last opinion is favored by the coincidence of several contemporary writers in the same error, which presupposes some plausible reason for it.

We now proceed to lay down our indirect proofs. 1. We begin with the testimony which gives precisely the year of the flight of Themistocles, that of Cicero, *Læl.* chap. 12. It is true, Corsini, l. c. 3, p. 180, asserts, that Cicero speaks of the year in which The-

mistocles was banished from Athens; but we need only examine the passage, to be convinced of the contrary: "*Themistocles — fecit idem, quod* 20. *annis ante apud nos fecerat Coriolanus.*" The flight of Coriolanus to the Volci falls in the year 263 U. C., B. C. 492. The flight of Themistocles is accordingly placed by Cicero in the year 472, a year later than by us, which is of no importance, since the round number twenty was the more suitable to the object of Cicero, as the more accurate nineteen, for the Chronologists. If Dodwell's view were correct, there would be the space of twenty-seven years between the two events.

2. Diodorus Siculus, who, 11, 55, places the flight of Themistocles in Ol. 77, 2 (B. C. 471), in any event favors our determination, which ascends only two years higher, far more than the opposite one. We remark, however, that he also places in the same year the residence of Themistocles at Magnesia, and his death; and thus it is evident, that whether by mistake or design, he compresses the events in the life of Themistocles, which filled up some years, into the year of his death. If this took place in the year 471, the flight must be dated at least as far back as 473. Our determination differs only a single year from that of Eusebius, who relates the flight of Themistocles in Ol. 77, 1.

3. But that which forms the chief argument, the whole series of transactions, as they have been recorded in accurate order, especially by Thucydides, compels us without reserve to place the flight of Themistocles not below the year 473. That the expedition of the allied Greeks under the direction of Pausanias, against Cyprus and Byzantium, the capture of the latter city, and the transfer of the supremacy from the Lacedemonians to the Athenians, occasioned by the insolence of Pausanias, fall in the year 477, we may regard as established beyond dispute by Clinton, p. 270 sq.* The view of O. Müller (*Dorier*, II. p. 498), who distributes these events into a period of five years, is contradicted by the expression ἐν τῇδε τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ of Thucydides, chap. 94, whereby the capture of Byzantium is brought into the same year with the expedition against Cyprus.

* The grounds are thus briefly summed up by Win., p. 252. "Dodwelli rationi neutiquam favet Isocratis auctoritas. Repugnat rerum gestarum series, repugnat quod Thucyd. significat, Plutarchus et Aristides diserte tradunt, repugnat denique temporis spatium, quod Atheniensium imperio assignant Lysias, Isocrates ipse, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristides, quibus fortasse addendus est Lycurgus."

That these words cannot be connected with what follows, without a change of the text in opposition to all critical authority, is shown by Poppo. Moreover, the very last of these events is placed, by the unanimous testimony of antiquity, in the year 477. Clinton shows, p. 249, that all reckonings of the time of the supremacy of the Athenians, setting out from this year, differ from one another only in reference to the assumed termination. Also, Thucyd. chap. 128, the expedition against Cyprus, and that against Byzantium, are connected as immediately succeeding each other. If, however, Dodwell were compelled by the force of the arguments to acknowledge, that these events, which he compresses into one year, do not, as he assumes, (p. 61,) belong to the year 470, but to the year 477, he would surely be compelled, perceiving it to be impossible to lengthen out the thread of the events until the year 465, to give up the whole hypothesis. The dissatisfaction of the allies was followed by the recall of Pausanias. That this belongs still to the same year, plainly appears, partly from the nature of the case itself, since it presupposes a continuance of supremacy, partly from Thucydides, chap. 95: *ἐν τούτῳ δὲ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι μετεπέμποντο Παυσανίαν, ἀνακρινοῦντες ὧν περὶ ἐπυνθάνοντο.* Pausanias having come to Sparta, and been there set at liberty, now betook himself privately in a galley to Byzantium. This cannot have happened long afterwards, for Thucydides, chap. 128, immediately subjoins it, and what is of the most importance, Pausanias finds the fleet still at Byzantium. That his residence there did not long continue, appears from the account of Thucydides, chap. 131, that he was forcibly expelled thence by the Athenians. He now retired to the colony in Troas; from there, he was recalled to Sparta, after it had been reported that he kept up an understanding with the barbarians. The Ephori threw him into prison, but soon after released him. At this time, his intercourse with Themistocles took place, who, being at the time already expelled from Athens, resided at Argos, and thence made excursions into the rest of the Peloponnesus. That Pausanias then for the first time drew Themistocles into his plan, when the latter had been driven from Athens, is asserted by Plutarch, and a personal intercourse between them is rendered certain by all accounts. That there was no considerable period between this release of Pausanias, and his death, is clear. Pausanias was not condemned, because there was no certain proof against him. It is, however, psychologically improbable, that he did not soon afford it, that he prudently kept himself from

giving open offence for a series of years, when we consider that he was deprived of all prudence by his haughtiness, arising to madness, that he himself rendered the execution of his treasonable plan impossible; that, according to Thucydides, chap. 130, he went about in a Median dress, and caused himself to be accompanied on a journey through Thrace with Median and Egyptian satellites, spread a Persian table, made difficult the access to his person, gave free course to his passions, of whom Thucydides himself very significantly remarks, *καὶ κατέχειν τὴν διάνοιαν οὐκ ἠδύνατο, ἀλλ' ἔργοις βραχέσι προὐδήλου, ἃ τῇ γνώμῃ μειζόνως ἐξέπειτα ἔμελλε πράξειν*, and of whose senseless arrogance the same historian, chap. 132, gives an example, even out of the time immediately after the battle of Platea. The discovery was effected by him who was to bring to Artabazus the last letters to the king. With what haste the transactions were carried on, and that by no means a space of four years was consumed, is evident from the fact, that the king, in order to accelerate them, had expressly sent Artabazus to Asia Minor. His death immediately followed the discovery (comp. Thucyd. 133). We surely do not assume too little, when we give to these events a period of three years. That we need not go beyond this, is shown by Diodorus, who compresses all these events into the year 477 (Ol. 75, 4.) How could he have done this, or how could such an error have arisen, if the beginning and end had been separated from each other by a period of 8–9 years? How impossible it was for him, with his sources, to place the destruction of Pausanias far beyond this time, appears from his fiction, which can in no other way be explained, of a twofold accusation of Themistocles. If, now, we must place the death of Pausanias about the year 474, and in no event later, the flight of Themistocles cannot be placed farther back than the year 473. For Themistocles at the death of Pausanias had already been a considerable time in the Peloponnesus. His accusation followed immediately after the event; comp. Thucydides, 1, 135; and the combined interests of the Lacedemonians, to whom nothing could be more desirable than to have the Athenians share their disgrace, and of the enemies of Themistocles at Athens (Plut. *Them.* c. 23: *κατεβόων μὲν αὐτοῦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, κατηγόρουν δ' οἱ φθονοῦντες τῶν πολιτῶν*) would cause the decision to be hastened as much as possible. Themistocles, persecuted both by the Athenians and Lacedemonians, now flees from the Peloponnesus to Corcyra. Being denied a residence there, he retires to the opposite continent. In danger of being

overtaken by his persecutors, (Thucyd. chap. 136: *καὶ διωκόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν προοτεταγμένων κατὰ πύστιν ἦ χωροίη,*) he sees himself compelled to flee to Admetus, the king of the Molossians. Nor can he have long resided there, for, according to Thucydides, chap. 137, he was sent forward by Admetus, as soon as his persecutors came. And how can we suppose, that they would have been long behind him? How long could his place of residence have remained a secret? It is expressly said by Thucydides, that the coming of his persecutors, and the flight of Themistocles to Asia, very soon happened (*ὕστερον οὐ πολλῷ*). It is true, that if we could credit the account of Stesimbrotus, in Plut. chap. 24, we must assume that the residence of Themistocles with Admetus continued some months. For he related that his friends brought to him there, his wife and children, whom they had secretly conducted out of Athens. But that no dependence is to be placed upon this, is evident from the absurd fiction of Stesimbrotus that immediately follows, which, to the surprise even of Plutarch, (*εἶτ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐπιλαθόμενος τούτων, ἢ τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα ποιῶν ἐπιλαθόμενον, πλεῦσαί φησιν κ. τ. λ.,*) he brings forward, without observing that the one fable does away the other, viz., that Themistocles was sent by Admetus to Sicily, and had desired of Hiero his daughter in marriage, with the promise to bring Greece under subjection to him. Plutarch designates Stesimbrotus as a shameless liar. *Pericles*, chap. 13. That the sons of Themistocles remained in Athens, is manifest from a relation in Suidas, and the testimony of Thucydides, chap. 137, and of Plutarch, that the gold was first sent to Themistocles by his friends, after his arrival in Asia, to enable him to reward the service of the captain who brought him to Asia, shows at the same time the incorrectness of the assertion of Stesimbrotus, and confirms the opinion, that Themistocles remained in no one place of his flight long enough for his friends to send to him there the necessary gold. Themistocles was conducted by Admetus to Pidna, and from there, he betook himself in a boat directly to Asia. This, accordingly, since between the death of Pausanias, and the coming of Themistocles into Asia, there could at most be only a year, can at latest have happened in the year 473, perhaps in 474; and even in the former case, we are completely justified in placing the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes, which still cannot have immediately coincided with the coming of Themistocles, in the year 474.

4. On the supposition that the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes, and the flight of Themistocles, fall in 465, an extravagant old age must be attributed to Charon of Lampsacus. According to Suidas, he was still flourishing under the first Darius, Ol. 69, 504 B. C. Since now, in his history, he mentions the flight of Themistocles to Artaxerxes, this being placed in 465, he must have been employed in writing history at least forty years. This is not, indeed, absolutely impossible; but in a doubtful case it must be rejected as the more improbable alternative. "*Historiæ enim non sunt explicandæ*, — says Vitringa, (*Proll. in Zach.* p. 29,) — *ex raris et insolentibus exemplis, sed ex communi vivendi lege et ordine. Si res secus se habeat, in ipsa historia ascribitur ne fallat incautos.*" Compare his farther excellent remarks on this subject. That this argument is not without force, is evident even from the efforts of some advocates of the false chronology, to set it aside by cutting the knot. Suidas, after he has cited the abovementioned determination of the time of Charon, as he found it in his more ancient authorities, subjoins, *μᾶλλον δὲ ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν Περσικῶν*. Creuzer, on the *fragm. historr. Græc.* p. 95, rejects this date without farther examination, because it gives too great an age to Charon.

5. According to Thucyd. 1, 136, Themistocles, on his passage to Asia, fell in with the Athenian fleet, which was besieging Naxos. This siege of Naxos, however, according to the testimony of Thucydides, chap. 100, which makes all other arguments superfluous, happened before the great victory of the Athenians on the Eurymedon, which, according to Diodorus, belongs to the year 470, and cannot be placed later, because this was the first considerable undertaking of the Athenians against the Persians, the war with whom formed the only ground for the important requisitions which they made upon their allies; comp. Thucyd. 1, 94. Hitherto, since the supremacy had passed over to the Athenians, scarcely any thing had been done against the Persians, except the taking of the unimportant Ægon. Thucydides also leads us to about the same year as that given by Diodorus, who connects the defection of Thasos (467) with *χρόνῳ ὕστερον*, which cannot stand where events immediately succeed each other. Even for these reasons the siege of Naxos and the flight of Themistocles do not fall after 471. If, however, we consider, that Naxos was the first confederate city with which the Athenians were involved in discord, comp. Thucyd. P. 1, 98, (which, from the nature of the case, as is rendered especially clear by the remarks of Thu-

cydides and a comparison of the later historians, could scarcely have first happened after seven years), and if we farther consider the way in which Thucydides, chap. 98, connects the events, from the transfer of the supremacy until the capture of Naxos, with one another, we shall, without hesitation, place the latter some years earlier, in the year 474 or 473.

6. The flight of Themistocles falls at least three years earlier than the battle on the Eurymedon, because in all probability he was dead before the latter event. His death, however, must have been some years subsequent to his coming into Asia, comp. Thucyd. chap. 138. One year passed in learning the language, and some time, in any event, was required for what is implied in *ταύτης ἦρχε τῆς χώρας, δόντος κ. τ. λ.* Thucydides relates, that, according to the account of some, Themistocles took poison, *ἀδύνατον νομίσαντα εἶναι ἐπιτελέσαι βασιλεῖ, ἃ ὑπέσχετο.* This presupposes that Themistocles was compelled to fulfil his promises, and had this not been the case at his death, the report, that Thucydides only in this instance relied upon himself, could not have arisen. Plutarch expressly connects the death of Themistocles with the expedition of Cimon. This is done by several writers, with the mention of the most special circumstances, compare the passages in Staveren on *Nep. Them.* 10, all which may be regarded as they are by Cicero, *Brut.* chap. 11, and Nepos, as fictitious, and yet the historical basis on which alone every thing depends, *the fact* that Thucydides died before the battle on the Eurymedon, is firmly established.

7. Krüger, l. c. p 218, has shown that the account of Plutarch, that Themistocles reached an age of sixty-five years, forbids us to place his death beyond the year 470, and therefore his flight beyond the year 473. According to an account which has internal evidence of credibility in Ælian, *Var. Hist.* III. 21, Themistocles, as a small boy coming from school, declined going out of the way of the tyrant Pisistratus. Assuming that this happened in the last year of Pisistratus, B. C. 529, and that Themistocles was at that time six years old, he must have been born 535, and died 470. Nor is it a valid objection, that according to Plutarch, Themistocles was still living at the time of the Cyprian expedition of Cimon (449, B. C.), and was still young at the battle of Marathon. For the former rests on a manifest confounding of the former event, with the victory over the Persian fleet at Cyprus, which is supposed to have immediately preceded the victory on the Eurymedon, (comp. Diodor. 11, 60,

Dahlmann, *Forschungen*, I. p. 69,) and the latter merely on a conclusion drawn from this error. "Whoever," remarks Dahlmann, p. 71, "reads without prejudice the passage, Thucyd. 1, 138, will perceive that the death of Themistocles followed pretty soon after his settlement in Persia; probably in the second year, if Thucydides is worthy of credit."

Until all these arguments are refuted, it remains true, that the Messianic interpretation of the prophecy is the only correct one, and that the alleged Pseudo Daniel, as well as the real Daniel, possessed an insight into the future, which could have been given only by the Spirit of God; and hence, as this favor could have been shown to no deceiver, the genuineness of the book necessarily follows, and the futility of all objections against it is already manifest.

THE LAST WEEK AND ITS HALF.

We showed, that the last week begins with the public appearing of the anointed, and that his death falls in the middle of it, while the confirmation of the covenant extends entirely through it. There is here no occasion to show, except in reference to one point, the death of Christ, how accurately the prophecy and fulfilment coincide. For the *terminus ad quem* of the confirmation of the covenant being more or less indefinite, is incapable of any accurate chronological determination. It is sufficient to remark, that in the first years after the death of Christ, the ἐκλογή was collected from among the ancient covenant people, — with what success is shown, e. g., by the history of the first Pentecost, — and that then the message concerning Christ was carried also to the heathen, so that the prophet might justly represent the salvation, as subjectively and objectively completed in the end of the 70 weeks, for the covenant people, of whom alone he speaks.

The view, that the death of Christ is separated from his baptism by a period of three and a half years, is found in several fathers. Thus in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, 10: οὐδ' ὅλος ὁ μεταξὺ τετραέτης παρίσταται χρόνος; and while he makes an erroneous calculation to sustain his result, (comp. Valesius, *Anm.* on the passage,) in Theodoret an entirely correct basis, almost beyond his age, is adopted. See on

the passage, Tom. II. p. 1250, ed. Hal.: *εἰ δέ τις καὶ τὸν χρόνον καταμαθεῖν ἐθέλει, ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωαννὴν εὐαγγελίου μαθήσεται· ὡς περὶ τὰ τρία ἔτη καὶ ἥμισυ κηρύξας ὁ κύριος καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους αὐτοῦ μαθητὰς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ καὶ τοῖς θαύμασι βεβαιώσας, τότε τὸ πάθος ὑπέμεινε.*

The decision depends entirely on the Evangelist John. Three passovers during the ministry of Christ are expressly mentioned by him, comp. 2: 13, 6: 4, and then the last. A fourth is the subject of controversy. According to what may be proved from chap. 5: 1, (*μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,*) must the death of Christ be placed in the fourth or in the third year after his public appearance.

The answer of the question, what feast is meant in this passage, is greatly simplified by the circumstance, that in recent times it is generally confessed, that the choice can lie only between the feast of Purim and the Passover. This concession, moreover, rests on so good a ground, that we can confidently pass over the remaining opinions in silence. It appears particularly from John 4: 35, where the Lord says, There are yet four months to the harvest, that at that time, before the feast mentioned chap. 5: 1, and since the first passover mentioned chap. 2: 13, eight months had already elapsed. For the *terminus ad quem* of these four months, is the new passover, since, with the passover, according to law and custom, the harvest in Palestine began. The feasts of Pentecost and of Tabernacles of this year are therefore excluded, because both lie within the above-mentioned period of eight months, and, should it be referred to one of these feasts in the following year, it would be equally in favor of our view. It would thereby be taken for granted, that John has omitted to mention one passover.

The assertion, that the feast of Purim is mentioned, the more deserves a thorough investigation, since having, in former times, been kept more in the background, it has lately found many able defenders. The first place among them is occupied by Hug, *Einl.* Th. 2, p. 197, ff. ed. 2. He is followed by Lücke and Tholuck.

The chief argument advanced for this opinion, and against the passover, is the following. As the Lord remained at home till after the passover, of which mention is made some days after his return, he did not appear in Jerusalem from the time of the supposed passover, until this, i. e. for a whole year, and for six months longer, until the feast of tabernacles, and consequently neglected the duty

of the public worship of God for a year and a half. This supposition entirely contradicts the purpose of Jesus to fulfil even external righteousness; besides, by such conduct, he would have exposed himself to public reproach. — Truly a strange reason; for, by his going to the feast of Purim, the case of Christ would have been neither better nor worse. Attending on this feast could not be reckoned as a fulfilment of righteousness; for it was not prescribed in the law of God, and it was only under this, and not human ordinance, that the Son of God was placed. Prudential reasons could just as little have moved him to this course; for no human ordinance required the celebration of the feast of Purim at Jerusalem. If, therefore, the difficulty were real, it would affect the defenders of this view, no less than ourselves. Whoever was at Jerusalem through the whole of the rest of the year, and absented himself only in the three feasts, whose celebration in Jerusalem had been prescribed, was just as much guilty of the violation of the law, as he, who never set his foot in Jerusalem. Besides, the whole difficulty is only an apparent one. The reason why Jesus remained so long away from Jerusalem, is plainly enough given, chap. 7 : 1 : οὐ γὰρ ἤθελεν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν, ὅτι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι. But this reason was completely decisive for the Lord, according to the position which he always took in reference to the ceremonial law. He held himself bound to the observance of it, only so far as it did not conflict with higher purposes. These were never sacrificed to it. Classic, in this respect, is the passage, Matt. 12 : 3. The Lord there points those, who accused his disciples of violating the ceremonial law, for proof, that it is not binding under all circumstances, to the example of David, who, without being on that account blamed in the Scripture, ate the shew bread, contrary to the law. He next points to his absolute authority, which justifies him in breaking the law, when this would promote his higher purposes. He calls himself the Lord of the Sabbath. He designates himself, as a greater than the temple. The hour of Christ was not yet come; his presence at Jerusalem, must have been an occasion to his enemies, to strive to hasten it before the time; not to employ the human means to avoid this danger, would be to tempt God. — Even for those, who were not like the Son of God, the Lord of the Sabbath, and of the feasts, but unconditionally subject to the law, the binding force of the outward religious ordinances of the law was daily becoming weaker. Was the temple at the time already changed into a den of robbers, Luke

19: 46, was the ungodliness already in the process of full developement, which soon afterwards made it completely a house of abomination, how then could the laws be applied in their whole extent, which relate to it as the house of God? The temple by no means consisted of lime and stone; as to its essential nature, it was at that time already as much destroyed, as during the Babylonish exile, and the neglect to visit it was therefore as little censurable now as then, if circumstances directed the attention to that view, according to which, it was no more a house of God.

This argument is, however, the only one which has been thought valid in recent times. The remaining "*argumenta ficulnea*," which Lamy, and D'Outrein in the *Bibl. Brem.* I. p. 610, have adduced, we can therefore well omit, especially as Lampe has already thoroughly refuted them. Let us then proceed to lay down the arguments for our own view.

1. It can admit of no doubt, that John does not here speak of a *festum aliquod*, but designates a definite feast. Otherwise, he would act in direct opposition to the object, which the accurate mention of the feasts by him, serves everywhere to promote. They are his dates, according to which, he orders the whole history. He mentions the passover, accordingly, even where Christ does not observe it, 6: 4. Every feast is always elsewhere accurately designated by him; and this is entirely natural, since an indefinite feast cannot serve as a measure of time. We translate, therefore, *the* feast of the Jews, without availing ourselves of the article occurring in many manuscripts, except as a proof that this interpretation is very ancient. The omission of the article should not have been objected against it by Lücke and Tholuck. According to a Hebraism as widely spread through the Seventy, and the N. Test., as it has been little observed, (comp. Ew. p. 579,) the definite article stands before the second instead of the first of two nouns, connected by the genitive case. We cite only a few from a number of examples. Deut. 16: 13, ἑορτὴν τῶν σκηνῶν (in the Hebr. חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת) ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ. Matt. 12: 24, ἐν τῷ βεελζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων, where Fritzsche, because this use was unknown to him, in opposition to all manuscripts, proposes to change the text: ἐν *B.* τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων. Luke 2: 11, ἐν πόλει Δαβίδ. The *Nom. propr.*, as also in Hebrew, where עִיר דָּוִד can only mean *the*, not *a*, city of David, is equivalent to an appellative with the article. Acts 8: 5, εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας, in *the* city, the capital of Samaria, (comp. Heumann and Kuinöl on

the passage. But if it is established, that here the discourse is concerning the feast of the Jews, *κατ. ἐξ.*, who could think of any other feast than that of the passover? It is this which had already been mentioned in the preceding context, chap. 2: 13. No other can come in competition with it. Among all, it was by far the greatest; comp. the proofs in Lund, p. 974. The *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* is never used by John of any other feast than the three great ones appointed in the law, twice of the passover, otherwise of the feast of tabernacles. By what means can it be proved, that the idea occurred, even at a later period, to place the feast of Purim upon a level with these feasts, and particularly the passover? The passages cited by Hug, p. 200, do not refer to the feast, but to the book of Esther. The feast was always regarded more as a feast of the people, than a religious ordinance. The knowledge of the opposition against its introduction in the outset, has not been lost, comp. Lightfoot on John 10: 22. And then how can we argue from that later period to the former. It was entirely natural, that the feast should gain in esteem as the Jews became more carnally minded; that the three chief feasts, on the contrary, should retain their exclusive dignity, so long as the temple stood, and the whole mass of the people went up for their celebration to Jerusalem.

2. An invincible difficulty in the way of a reference to the feast of Purim, is presented by the *ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*, in connexion with v. 14, from which it seems evident, that the city was filled with those who sought the festival. That men did not journey to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of Purim, arose from the nature of the case. The feast stood in no relation to the temple; even in Jerusalem it was not celebrated with any divine service. The whole celebration was limited to reading the book of Esther, which was brought into the synagogues, to abstaining from labor, and eating and drinking. The feast was kept among the Jews of the dispersion, at an earlier period than by those of Palestine. We can abundantly show, from definite testimonies, that a journey to Jerusalem on the feast of Purim, was never thought of. Josephus, *Arch.* 11, 6, says: the Purim was celebrated by the Jews of all places, and was attended by feasting. In the Talmud Cod. Megillah, cap. 1, § 1–3, it is determined at what time the Purim should be celebrated in the cities, which, at the time of Joshua, were surrounded with walls, in those which at that time were without walls, and in the villages; comp., on the ground of these determinations, Vitringa, *de*

decem otiosis, c. 18, in *Ugolini Thes.* t. 21, p. 421 sq. An appeal cannot be made in opposition to this, that Jesus still, according to 10 : 22, was at Jerusalem in the *Enkania*, which, in like manner, could be celebrated out of Jerusalem. This would at most only be of importance, if Jesus had journeyed to Jerusalem for this purpose. But the object of his journey was only to attend the feast of tabernacles. He still remained a considerable time afterwards in Jerusalem, and during his stay there the *Enkania* happened. And besides, if this were not so, still the *Enkania*, as a feast of the dedication of the temple, stood in so close a relation to it, that, in this instance, many probably performed what the law did not require.

3. It is in a high degree improbable, that Jesus sought the feast of Purim, and neglected the passover, which happened a month later. After every effort, it is impossible to adduce even a plausible reason for this. The cited passage, John 7 : 1, in which Lücke, though with great hesitation, believes he finds such a proof, proves directly the opposite. In the feast of the passover, Christ was protected by the Galilean ὄχλοι ; in the Purim his enemies had free scope (Mark 14 : 2, Lücke on 10 : 22). And was there any thing in the nature of the feast of Purim, which could attract Jesus? We are far from wishing to attack the authority of the book of Esther, but still, in respect to the true standard, its reference to Christ, it undoubtedly holds the lowest place among all the books of the Old Testament. Is it conceivable, that he, who never even in the slightest manner mentions this book, whose apostles nowhere appeal to it, should have diligently, — as Hug asserts, — sought the feast, which was consecrated to the remembrance of the event described in this book, in order to manifest esteem and regard for it? And was indeed a feast like this, where drinking was *meritorious*, where it was customary to drink until they could no longer distinguish between Blessed be Mordecai, and Accursed be Haman, suited to effect the object of the Lord in all his journeys to Jerusalem? Surely even a human teacher would not thus choose time and place.

4. The healing of the sick person happened, according to v. 9, on the sabbath, and that this sabbath belonged to the feast, appears from the mode of the connexion of v. 1 and 2, and also from v. 13. Here, however, the feast of Purim is entirely excluded; this could not be celebrated on the sabbath, because the two were inconsistent with one another, and because the divine institution could not give way to the human. If it happened on such a day, it was deferred;

comp. the proofs in Reland, *Antiqq. Sacr.* IV. 9, and in Schickard, *De Festo Purim*, in the *Crit. Sacr.* VI. p. 491 sq. Ff.

5. The sick man whom the Lord healed, had been sick thirty-eight years. We consider this man as a type of the Jewish people, and find in the thirty-eight years a reference to the thirty-eight years' affliction of Israel on the journey through the wilderness, which was terminated by the first passover in Canaan; which was at the same time the feast of reconciliation with the Lord, after the immediately preceding renewed circumcision had removed the reproach of Egypt from the people, and freed them from the guilt of the impurity which they had brought with them out of Egypt, comp. Josh. chap. 5. We know that this ground will appear strange to some, but perhaps they will recover from their astonishment, if they more carefully consider the many New Testament analogies in its favor, as they have been collected in part by De Wette, in the *Beitrage zur Characteristik des Hebraismus* (*Studien*, 1807, II. p. 245). Is it indeed any thing else, when John, 19: 36, refers a passage which originally concerns the Easter lamb, directly to Christ? When, according to him, Jesus, in chap. 6, takes occasion from the nearness of the passover, to speak of himself as the true bread, and true flesh, that which the unleavened bread and the Paschal lamb typified? Or when, chap. 7: 37, he represents himself as the substance of a sacred usage, which prevailed during the feast of tabernacles. On this subject much might still be said. The elucidation of the doctrine of types, which are now entirely neglected, is an important problem for future theologians. Still, we hope that even for those, with whom this argument has no weight, our assertion is sufficiently proved, and at the same time our problem solved. In reference to an important argument, arising from a comparison of the remaining Gospels, see the acute essay of Süfskind, in Bengel's *Arch.* I. p. 185 sq.

THE NON-MESSIANIC INTERPRETERS.

Among them, we mention only those whose efforts cannot be regarded as already completely antiquated, and therefore, with the omission of Eichhorn, Ammon, and others, we shall mention only Bertholdt, whom Rosenmüller unconditionally follows, Bleek (in the

Theologischen Zeitschrift, III. p. 290 sq.), and Hitzig, in the *Studien*, l. c. We confine ourselves at the same time, solely to the refutation of that, which has not been already settled in the exposition.

All these interpreters agree, that the alleged Pseudo-Daniel, because the time fixed by Jeremiah had long been passed without the fulfilment of the prophecy, has attempted a sort of mystical interpretation or parody of the 70 years. They are not 70 years, but 70 weeks of years. They also coincide in the following points; like most of the Jewish interpreters, they take, as the *terminus a quo*, the year of the destruction of Jerusalem, and therefore regard the whole time of the desolation of the city as included in the 70 weeks; they explain the anointed in v. 25 and in v. 26, as different persons, and indeed the first as Cyrus; finally, by the prince that should come, they understand Antiochus Epiphanes, and regard his death, and the redemption of the covenant people, as the extreme *terminus ad quem* of the prophecy. In all these instances, they have as a predecessor, Marsham, who may justly be designated as a Rationalist embryo, but who has at least the credit of having given occasion to the admirable treatise of Vitringa, already repeatedly quoted. They differ from one another in the determination of the anointed, who should be cut off, in v. 26. According to Bertholdt and Rosenmüller, it is Alexander; according to Bleek and Hitzig, Seleucus IV. Philopator, brother of Antiochus Epiphanes, and his immediate predecessor, who was put to death by poison. For he is plainly meant by both, although the former strangely confounds him with the founder of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ, Seleucus Nicator. The latter designates him as Seleucus III. These views have already been sufficiently refuted in what precedes. What we here advance against them, we may consider only as a work of supererogation.

1. We do not perceive how the alleged Pseudo-Daniel could regard the prophecies of Jeremiah, as not fulfilled, and hence derive a reason for making them a subject of parody. These prophecies have no reference to the Messiah. What they announce as about to happen in the end of the 70 years, the cessation of the Chaldee servitude, and the return of the covenant people to their native land, was precisely fulfilled at the appointed time (comp. *Beitr.* I. p. 181). Our author himself regards it in this light, when he says, 1, 21, that Daniel lived to witness the fourth year of Cyrus, the time of redemption earnestly desired by him, comp. *Beitr.* I. p. 65, and p. 314, and

in like manner is it so considered elsewhere in the Scripture, Ezra 1 : 1, 2 Chron. 36 : 21.

2. A mystic interpretation, which should at once change 70 years into 490, is so plainly capricious, that it could not be adopted without intending to ridicule Jeremiah, and represent him as a false prophet. For how could the author suppose that any one would regard such an interpretation as in earnest. But can it be imagined, that his object could have been in so gross a manner to undermine the authority of the older prophets, when he confesses, v. 6, as the greatest transgression of the people against God, that they have not hearkened to the voice of his servants, the prophets, who spake in his name? How could the alleged Pseudo-Daniel expect much weight to be laid on the new determination of time to be given by him, when, in so absurd a way, he set aside that which had been formerly given by a prophet universally reverenced.

3. Even if the author had wished to give only a parody of the prophecies of Jeremiah, still it was indispensably necessary to assume the same *terminus a quo* for the 70 weeks of years, which Jeremiah had assumed for his 70 years. This, however, in the two prophecies relating to the subject, happened in the fourth year of Jehoiachim (comp. *Beitr.* l. c.). How then, except by a *salto mortale*, could the author pass over from this year to the time of the destruction of the city, eighteen years. How could he suddenly, instead of reckoning 70 years from the *terminus a quo* of Jeremiah, until the *terminus ad quem*, as he himself has done in v. 2, and as the Scriptures everywhere do, assign to this period only 49 years? Hitzig endeavours to meet this difficulty by the supposition, that the author reckons from the date of the prophecy, chap. 29, which is there indefinite, and which he places in the year of the destruction. But the date of this prophecy is unimportant, since this is not placed in the same as the *terminus a quo* of the exile, and since the determination of it is presupposed as known from the prophecy, chap. 25, and here as well as there the beginning of the Babylonish servitude, as it happened in the fourth year of Jehoiachim, is firmly established as such (comp. *Beitr.* l. c.). Granting, however, that the date of the letter coincided with the *terminus a quo* of the 70 years, though this is inconceivable, how could the author have thought of placing this letter in the year of the destruction? It is false that its date is not chronologically determined in Jeremiah. This prophecy is connected by a *vav* with that which immediately precedes, which in the superscription is des-

ignated as belonging to the fourth year of Zedekiah. The contents of both are closely related; chap. 28 describes how Jeremiah checked the hopes, which were excited and cherished by the false prophets, of a speedy favorable change of affairs in Jerusalem; chap. 29, how he did the same among the exiles. These hopes were plainly awakened by the same event at Jerusalem, and among the exiles. This event is plainly enough announced in chap. 28. Zedekiah, in the fourth year of his reign, probably by means of a journey to Babylon, comp. 51, 59, had obtained great freedom and independence, on which account his fourth year, v. 1, is designated as the beginning of his reign. Hence the hope was derived, that he would be able, as his hands were now free, with the help of the Egyptians, to deliver himself entirely from the Babylonish yoke, and compel the Chaldeans to liberate the exiles. But if now we should place the *terminus a quo* in this fourth year of Zedekiah, there would not be till the time of Cyrus, forty-nine, but fifty-nine years. For, from the destruction of the city until Cyrus, there are not, — as Hitzig supposes, — precisely forty-nine, but fifty-two years, and this destruction happened in the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah. To attribute a chronological error to the author, is the more unjustifiable, since he everywhere manifests a very particular and accurate knowledge of this period, and since in reference to these chronological determinations, which are so obvious in the Scriptures, unanimity has ever prevailed among the Jews.

4. Against the destruction as *terminus a quo*, we appeal to the manifest contradiction of v. 24, with v. 2, according to which, 70 years were to be completed over the desolations of Jerusalem. How could the years which would be completed over the desolation, be included in those which should be completed over the city?

5. דָּבָר, without the article, cannot relate to the definite beforementioned oracle of Jeremiah. That a prophetical *annunciation* cannot be thereby understood, but only a divine *command*, is shown by a comparison of יֹצֵא דָּבָר, from the going forth of the command, that 70 weeks should elapse over Jerusalem, in v. 23. But where do we find in Jeremiah a trace of any such divine *command* to restore Jerusalem? That the discourse relates to a command, which, as to time, coincides with the execution, we have already proved from וְחָרוּץ וּנְצוּק הָעִתִּים.

6. If the prophet wished merely to lengthen the period fixed by Jeremiah, still he must necessarily have placed here, as peculiar to

the end of the longer period, what Jeremiah had predicted as impending at the end of the period determined by him. Of this, however, there is no trace. There is no mention whatever in Jeremiah of any of the blessings, which, according to v. 24, belong to the end of the 70 weeks. On the contrary, what Jeremiah places as belonging to the end of the 70 years, the cessation of the Chaldean servitude, and the return to their native land, is here presupposed as having already taken place at the beginning of the weeks, which are determined over the city and over the people.

7. Did the *terminus ad quem* belong to the time of the Maccabees, Daniel would be guilty of so gross a violation of chronology, as would be irreconcilable with the chief arguments brought against the genuineness of the book, the accurate knowledge of history which it exhibits. The time from Cyrus to the death of Antiochus Epiphanes would then here be fixed at 441 years (63 weeks of years), while in reality it embraces only 372 years. An error in the calculation, therefore, of 69 years, must be assumed. This error becomes still more considerable, when connected with another assertion of these same interpreters. They suppose (comp., e. g., Bertholdt, p. 716) the author to be acquainted with only four Persian kings in all, after Cyrus, and that he makes Xerxes, as the last of them, to be vanquished by Alexander. And thus the Persian period is shortened by him 147 years, and this, as well as the 69 years of excess, must be added to those of the Seleucidæ. This now would amount to 380 years, and these must be divided among eight kings, including Antiochus Epiphanes. Truly, an error, for which there is not the most distant analogy in the chronological determination of this period by the most ignorant Jews! In the *Seder Olam*, cap. 30, its duration is determined at 180 years. The error of Josephus in reference to it (comp. Brink, *Examen Chronol. Jos.* in Havercamp, II. p. 298,) does not come into consideration. The case becomes still worse, when we consider, that Daniel, particularly in reference to this period, manifests a knowledge extending to the smallest particulars! Hence we perceive what grounds Bertholdt had for regarding the 70 weeks as a round and indefinite determination of time. Is not this escape from despair, provided beforehand, a proof, that he secretly perceives the difficulty to be insurmountable?

8. If the prophecy relates to the time of the Maccabees, why is it then entirely silent concerning the restoration of the city and the temple, of which all the prophecies of Daniel relating to this time,

speak? Why does it close with the mournful prediction of the entire and lasting desolation, which by no means belongs to that period? Truly, a poor consolation for the afflicted prophet! That is entirely wanting here, which deprives of its terrors the predicted desolation of city and temple, when the prophecy is referred to the Messianic time. In the time of the Maccabees, the theocracy was indeed actually subverted with the overthrow of city and temple, since its existence was at that time connected with them.

9. Bertholdt understands, as we have said, by the anointed, chap. 26, Alexander. Here, however, a whole swarm of difficulties arise. This anointed one is to die 62 weeks of years after Cyrus, and yet, between him and Cyrus, are to be only four kings, each of whom, therefore, must reign over one hundred years. He must die in the same week of years, i. e. in the 70th, at the end of which Antiochus Epiphanes is to perish. And yet, between him and Antiochus Epiphanes, according to the actual history, seven, and according to the reckoning of Bertholdt, ten kings are to reign! We well know that Bertholdt has endeavoured to remove these difficulties, by the supposition, that אַחֲרֵי does not mean *after*, but *before*. But whoever would choose to refute such assertions, must be very forgetful of the *sed fugit* and the *est modus*. No stomach has stronger power of digestion, than that of those who wish to evade the truth! הִכָּרֵת, which is used only of a violent death, because Alexander did not suffer such an one, is made to signify also, a calm death. A difficulty also arises with Seleucus Philopator. The anointed one is not to die until the end of the 62 weeks, and therefore in the 70th, and yet the end of Antiochus Epiphanes falls in this same week. But how can this be, since the latter reigned full eleven years? Our opponents can the less assume an error here, since they make the author contemporary with the events. That הִכָּרֵת elsewhere always occurs of a death of external violence alone, we merely observe in passing, and only hint at the impossibility which has already been shown, of understanding by נָגִיד, a heathen prince, sustaining no near relation to the theocracy.

10. The final reference of the prophecy to the time of the Maccabees, is contradicted by the uniform testimony of Jewish tradition. In the first book of the Maccabees, constant regard is paid to the prophecies, chap. 8 and 11, relating to that time, but there is no reference to this, comp. *Beitr.* I. p. 264. That in the time immediately after Christ, it was universally referred to a still future destruc-

tion, that by the Romans, we have shown in the same place, p. 265. To the passages there cited, is still to be added that, *De Bel. Jud.* 6. 5, 4, *ἀναγεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς λογίοις ἔχοντες, ἁλώσεσθαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸν ναὸν, ἐπειδὰν τὸ ἱερὸν γένηται τετράγωνον.* This, as Reland perceived, can only refer to the passage before us, by a false interpretation of בנך. On the other hand, the following, *τὸ δὲ ἐπάραν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἦν χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος ἐμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὑρημένος γράμμασιν, κ. τ. λ.* cannot, with Less (*Ueber Religion*, II. p. 708), and many others, be referred to the passage before us, since the *χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος* is plainly enough designated, as distinct from the beforementioned prophecy. Just as little can we agree with him in deriving from this prophecy alone, the expectation, at the time of the appearing of Christ, generally spread abroad among the Jews, and by them throughout the whole East, that the Messiah would appear precisely at that time, an expectation, which so many false Christs used for their own purposes. It certainly rests still more on that of chap. 2. By the fourth kingdom, at that time, was rightly understood, in general, the Roman; by the fifth, which should destroy this, the Messianic, comp. Joseph. 10. 10, 4. What, now, was more natural, than that from the time when the Roman power became hostile to the Jews, the appearing of the Messiah should be confidently expected. How general the reference of the prophecy to the destruction by the Romans was, is evident from the fact, that no later Jewish interpreter has ventured to relinquish this reference, which is so prejudicial to them in the controversy with the Christians, comp. the proofs in Sostmann, p. 18, ff. — That by the anointed, before unbelief had rendered the true reference to him who had appeared, impossible, the Messiah was generally understood, seems to follow from the circumstance, that this appellation of him who was expected, was generally prevalent at the time of Christ. This presupposes its being grounded in a highly esteemed prophecy, and such, in a special manner, was the one before us, at that time. It can be made probable, that Josephus adhered to this reference. This, however, requires so many preliminaries, that we are not able here, where we have no room to spare, to engage in the task. It must be previously shown, 1. That the so often repeated assertion, that Josephus regarded, or at least declared, Vespasian to be the Messiah, (comp. z. B. Ittig, *Prolegg.* in Havercamp, II. p. 93, and Bretschneider, *Capp. Theol. Jud. Dogm. ex Josepho*, p. 36,) is entirely erroneous, although even Origen, whose testimony is abused to

render suspicious that concerning Christ, seems to have held this opinion, while Suetonius, chap. 5, more considerately attributes nothing to Josephus, but what actually belongs to him, the annunciation of the establishment of the power of the Cæsars, in Vespasian. The foundation of this proof is the passage chap. 10. 10, 4, where Josephus, in believing confidence, expected the future establishment of the kingdom of glory, only he expressed himself with that forethought, which his difficult position, the great hatred of his countrymen, which even led them to accuse him before the Romans of *studii rerum novarum* (comp. *De Bell. Jud.* 7. 11), required. 2. That the passage concerning Christ is neither spurious, nor interpolated; and 3. That Josephus at the time of the composition of his works was a Christian, if we can give this name to one, who has lively impressions of the truth of Christianity, although still weak and unsettled in the faith, perhaps had become one by the mournful catastrophe, which he lived to witness.

11. The reference to the time of the Maccabees, and the whole Non-Messianic interpretation, will remain false, as long as the word of Christ remains true, therefore, to all eternity. That the passage, Matt. 24: 15, refers to this prophecy, has been shown in *Beitr.* I. p. 263, and that the Lord cites it, as a real prophecy, which concerned the destruction of city and temple, to be first fulfilled at a future time, in the same place, p. 266.

We now look around for the arguments against the Messianic interpretation, but one only presents itself; which, even if it were something more than a theological invalid, would still scarcely come off victorious in the contest with such a host of powerful opponents. "On the supposition of the genuineness of those prophecies, we must in no wise interpret them, so that therein will be given an accurate determination of the time of the establishment or completion of the kingdom of heaven. For when the Redeemer denies to the angels of heaven, and even to himself, such a knowledge of the future in reference to the time, and hour, Matt. 24: 36, Mark 13: 32, and even after his resurrection, Acts 1: 6, 7, we cannot possibly assume, that this should be revealed to another prophet, and moreover to one of a much earlier period, so that he could have commu-

nicated that time with chronological accuracy to his people, whether in the usual, or in any so called mystical measure of time, so far as this is still to be regarded as definite." Thus Bleek, l. c. p. 234. That is to say, in other words, because Christ did not consider it suitable to give to his disciples, who were eager for the reward before they had endured the conflict; who inquired about things beyond their comprehension, and not suited to their present condition, and thus forgot to strive for the one thing necessary for them, the being born from above; who were still carnal, and to whom the Lord had still much to say, which they were as yet unable to bear, a disclosure concerning the establishment of the *regni gloriæ*, which, on account of their condition, could only be injurious, the more so the further distant the completion of the salvation, and the more necessary it was that they should now be pointed directly to its *ground*, — therefore God cannot have given to a prophet of the Old Testament a disclosure of the time of the establishment of the *regni gratiæ*, and although a prophecy, investigated according to all the laws of a sound interpretation, accurately gives this time even to a year, and although no error in the interpretation and chronology can be pointed out, yet it is certain, beforehand, that it is false. But what right have we to refer what was said in respect to the *regnum gloriæ*, directly to the *regnum gratiæ?* What right to understand, as universally denied, that which is so concerning the former only in respect to one definite time? Bengel, in the most admirable manner in the *Gnomon*, and in the *Ordo Tempp.* p. 301 sq., has already refuted those, who have argued from these passages, against the existence of definite dates in the Apocalypse. He says, among other things, "*Non dixit, nemo* sciet, *sed nemo* scit. *Ipse jam jamque sciturus erat, et quum scientiam dici et horæ nactus fuit, ipsius erat scientiam dare, cui vellet et quando vellet.*" — That the ground of the Saviour's refusal lay in the condition of the disciples, is evident from Acts 1 : 7, *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς, οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*, comp. with v. 8, *ἀλλὰ λήψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*, i. q., it is not this which is necessary for you, but something else, and while God denies the former, he will grant the latter. The only course by which this argument would have the appearance of validity, would be to say, Shall God have imparted chronologically definite disclosures respecting future things to a prophet, when the Lord, who, even in his state of humiliation, was greater than all prophets, designated such disclosures as beyond his condition? Then,

however, the contest would be carried on at the same time against all other chronologically definite prophecies, not merely of the Old Testament, but also of Christ himself, who certainly predicted that after three days, he would rise again, and even against all prophecies, in which other contingent circumstances are predicted. For how are chronological determinations different from others? At the same time the greatest difficulties of other kinds arise. For how can we regard a whole province of divine knowledge as absolutely inaccessible, even when it would serve his purpose, to him, who knew that the Father *always* heard him, John 11 : 42, to whom the Father showed *all* things that he did, John 5 : 20. These passages, and a multitude of others, show that the correct view of the ignorance of the Lord, is rather this: Christ, in the state of humiliation, in which the divine nature was quiescent, received all that was requisite for the execution of his office, beyond the powers and gifts of his human nature, by communication from above, which he supplicated in prayer. In himself he possessed neither the power to do a miracle, nor to look through the future; but never was this power denied to his prayer, since on account of the unity of his will with that of God, he could pray for nothing, which was not in accordance with God's designs. Hence, it appears that the ignorance of the Son, was a simple consequence of his not willing; and this, again, was owing to the condition of his disciples. In like manner the Lord, without thereby in the least encroaching upon his power of working miracles, might have answered the demand of Satan to change stone into bread, that he could not do this. If, however, the ignorance of Christ was a consequence of the unsuitableness of the required knowledge in reference to time and persons, how can we infer from it, that he did not at another time impart the *suitable* chronologically definite disclosures respecting the future, to his servants, the prophets, and through them to his people.

END OF VOL. II.

CAMBRIDGE:

FOLSOM, WELLS, AND THURSTON,

PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

ERRATA IN VOL. II.

Page	9,	line	14	from the	bottom,	*for* faith	*read*	path
"	23,	"	8	"	top,	" inferior	"	another
"	27,	"	13	"	top,	" wages	"	ways
"	61,	"	5	"	top,	" *crowns*	"	*crown*
"	86,	"	19	"	bottom,	" here	"	were
"	134,	"	25	"	bottom,	" *fire*	"	*peg*
"	153,	"	12	"	top,	" shepherds	"	shepherd
"	158,	"	3	"	bottom,	" condition	"	conduct
"	182,	"	3	"	top,	" gold	"	money
"	186,	"	10	"	bottom,	" gold	"	money
"	186,	"	3	"	bottom,	" gold	"	money
"	188,	"	10	"	top,	" gold	"	money
"	188,	"	14	"	top,	" gold	"	money.
"	209,	"	1	"	top,	" *from*	"	*pan*
"	318,	"	1	"	bottom,	" confining	"	confirming

Date Due